GOLDWIN SMITH.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/factorsofciviliz02atlauoft

NOTE TO THE PUBLIC.

We feel assured that those who know under what difficulties and peculiar circumstances this work was written, and what little time we had to prepare it for the press, will readily excuse the numerous errors that have unfortunately crept into the text. We can only add here that in addition to these disadvantages, at the time when the proof should have had the closest attention, our eyes so failed us that it was with difficulty we could read at all.

To the public generally we can only state that our difficulties throughout have been very considerable, and we hope they will be taken into consideration when an uncouth sentence, or redundant words are noticed.

We note only a few orthographical errors here, and leave all other mistakes to the generous indulgence of each reader.

ERRATA.

For "pursue," 18th line, p. 37, read follow.
For "hell-mark," 4th line, p. 42, read hall-mark.
For "conquerers," 25th line, p. 46, read conquerors.
For "dependant," 8th line, p. 47, read dependent.
For "waving," last line, p. 47, read waiving.
For "benificent," in note [a], p. 56, read beneficent.
For "neccessary" 1st line, p. 69, read necessary.
For "neccessary," 7th line, p. 70, read necessary.
For "hoard," last line, p. 123, read horde.
For "waived," 12th line, p. 153, read waved.
For "leaving," 9th line. p. 203, read levying.
For "mortgagee," 26th and 28th lines, p. 241, read mortgager.
For "hoards," 5th line, p. 290, read hordes.
For "one-ideaed," 35th line, p. 319, read one-idead.
For "descendents," 5th line, p. 323, read descendants.

A COMMON-SENSE EXPOSITION OF THE BASES OF A PRACTICAL SYSTEM OF SOCIOLOGY.

THE

FACTORS OF CIVILIZATION.

In Two Parts and Three Volumes.

PART I.

THE ANALYSIS OF UNHAPPINESS.

VOLUME I.

1. On the Unhappiness due to Erroneous Theological Conceptions and Doctrines.
2. On the Unhappiness Arising from bad Forms of Government.
3. On the Unhappiness Arising from Ignorance.

VOLUME II.

1. On the Unhappiness Arising from Poverty.
2. On the Unhappiness Arising from Uncongenial Pursuits and Labor.

PART II.

VOLUME III.

THE ANALYSIS OF HAPPINESS.

* * * *

H.F.1427

THE FACTORS OF CIVILIZATION,

REAL AND ASSUMED:

CONSIDERED IN THEIR RELATION TO VICE, MISERY, HAPPINESS, UNHAPPINESS

—AND—

PROGRESS.

THE FACTORS CONSIDERED:

THEOLOGICAL, EDUCATIONAL,
GOVERNMENTAL, POLITICO-ECONOMICAL.

VOLUME II.

11-844
12/6/11

ATLANTA, GEORGIA:
Jas. P. Harrison & Co., Printers and Publishers.
1882.

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1882, by
J. H. BAILEY,
In the office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington.

To those who love God, AND *who have faith in humanity, and who desire that this world shall be the scene of the progressive happiness of the many, rather than an arena of combat of the strong against the weak, where the few only can attain demoralizing and unstable pleasures at the expense of their brothers, this work is dedicated by*

THE AUTHOR.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER IX.

On the influence of poverty in producing unhappiness--Impotence of all other factors to produce good results where poverty is extreme—The woman of Jerusalem—The Cannibals of Scotland—The insurrections in Madrid—Poverty, alone, capable of producing all wickedness—Influence of competence upon disposition—The Khurds—Some African Tribes—The South—The fear of poverty and the desire for wealth as pernicious in hardening the heart as the existence of poverty itself—The pursuit of wealth becomes a passion only where the result of being poor is terrible—Pernicious influence of the Church in the matter of eliminating poverty—The Church has encouraged and increased pauperism—The Church offers no remedy for the removal of poverty—Elimination of poverty to be obtained only by adopting a correct basis upon which to erect our system of Political Economy—How we may recognize this system.

CHAPTER X.

Examination of existing theories regarding the origin of poverty—Fallacy of the idea that poverty is a necessity imposed by nature—The "Subordination" theory exploded—Malthus examined—Ruskin refuted—De Cassagnac's theory right as far as it goes—Poverty shown to arise from private ownership of land—Examples in illustration—Rome, England, etc—Authorities to support the induction—Gibbon, Merivale, Cox, Green, Froude, etc.

CHAPTER XI.

Demonstration by deduction of the conclusion arrived at by induction in the last chapter, that poverty is a necessary consequence of private ownership of land—Impotence of factories to prevent this result—Scotland and England in illustration--Good government or bad government alike impotent to prevent this result—Good government more pernicious under certain circumstances than bad government.

CHAPTER XII.

Importance to us in the United States of the subject—Increase of competition—Increase of pauperism—Increase of crime and vice—New England and her wealth—New England and her poverty—Decrease of marriage—A little Roman History—Amount of land remaining the property of the people—The Arabs of the past and the "Arabs" of the present—How the land is being purchased by speculators.

CHAPTER XIII.

Impossibility of producing good by repressive legislative enactments—Slavery, Serfage, Mormonism—Why emancipation is ineffectual for good—Man cannot live by liberty alone—Inadequacy of the remedy proposed by John Stuart Mill—Inexpediency of Mr. George's remedy—The expedient and simple remedy—Details of the remedy—The happy solution of the Anti-monopoly question—The Woman question—The Greenback question and the Labor question embraced in the solution of the Land question—Examination of anticipated objections.

CHAPTER XIV.

Civilization of ancient Peru—To what cause due—Disastrous result of contact with European civilization—Impotence of Christianity to produce good where conditions are not favorable—Civilization of ancient Egypt—To what cause due—Disastrous result of changing the land laws, and of contact with the then modern and progressive civilization of Greece—The reason given—Some modern instances of the result of wise land laws—Burmah, Japan, Madagascar—A city in Hungary.

CHAPTER XV.

Impossibility of producing a thriving peasantry by subdivision of land, as long as the right to buy and sell is recognized—Examples in illustration—Rome, France, New England—The reason why Switzerland and the Tyrol are exceptions, and why they are able to furnish Mr. Ruskin with examples of happy people—How is it in Illinois and in the South?

CHAPTER XVI.

Of congeniality of occupation—Unhappiness arising from uncongenial pursuits and labor—The Caliph Abdalrahman and the historian Gibbon—Impotence of all causes to produce happy results as long as a man has to work at that which does not interest him—Necessity of securingto every man right of access to the soil, free of rent, to secure the possibility of all finding work at that labor which is congenial—Conclusion

APPENDIX.

The bases of civilization—Buckle's analysis and Bagehot's cake of custom—Analysis of the civilization of ancient Greece and Rome—Wherein defective—Granada under the Moors and under the Spaniards—European civilization—Wherein defective—The North and the South—To be or not to be?

PREFACE TO VOL. II.

In presenting this work to the public it is only proper that some reason be given why the second volume should be issued before the first.

The reason is simply this, that being obliged to publish the work at our own expense, we were not able to defray the cost of publishing both volumes of Part First at once, and in publishing the second volume rather than the first, we were induced to do so because the subject treated is of a more urgent character, and of more immediate practical importance than those subjects treated in the first volume. Though it is hoped that not only will the first volume be found as interesting to many as the second aspires to be, but that it will be indeed essential to a correct exposition of our views on the subjects treated. The first volume we hope to publish later in the winter or next spring.

Since this work has been written Mr. Mallock's "Social Equality" has appeared. Mr. Mallock and ourselves treat the same subject from entirely different standpoints, and consequently arrive at entirely different conclusions.

The position taken by us throughout the whole series of this work is, 1st. That man inclines naturally to goodness. 2nd. That all vice and misery arise from the operation of Theological causes, of Bad Government, of Ignorance, and of Poverty. In a word, that the structure of society is defective because of defective institutions.

Mr. Mallock argues "that the structure of society does not depend on the institutions, but that, on the contrary, the institutions depend on the structure."

To which we reply, that, while it is true the institutions of society depend on the structure of society, the institutions themselves are responsible for the continuance of the form of structure, and therefore, if on examination we find the structure defective, or what is worse, increasing in defectiveness in proportion as it adheres to and follows the guidance of the institutions, then we have reason to change the institutions in order to change the structure.

The progress of a carpenter's work depends on his ideas of how and what he is endeavoring to make, but if in the progress of that work he finds he is manufacturing a monstrosity, or a thing of no practical good, then he must change his ideas it he would produce by his work something of beauty or of utility.

Mr. Mallock is also not correct in his statement of the object sought to be attained by what he terms the "Democrats." Here is his statement: "The first and foremost of the principles of the Democrats is contained in the abstract proposition, *that the perfection of society involves social equality.*"—*Social Equality*, p. 25.

The principle of the Democrats however, as it happens, is not to be expressed in such a phrase. That first principle is, that the perfection of society depends upon the elimination of all artificial hindrances to the development of each man up to the level of his own capacity.

Consequently, when, in the progress of civilization, it is found that any artificial institution prevents the development of happiness, or prevents the rising of any man to the level of his capacity, it claims that as man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man, so man was not made for the sake of institutions, but institutions made for the sake of man, these are to be modified or thrown away whenever the happiness of man requires it. That Mr. Mallock should take issue with the truism that labor is the cause of wealth, and should seek to establish the "desire for social inequality" as the cause, is characteristic of the man.

It is only necessary to note that all his facts for such conclusion are drawn from but one source: The inability or inaptitude of some savages to develop civilization, even when nature has supplied them with all the necessities of life.

In our first volume we show why this is so in some instances; and we have also added an appendix to this volume to fully dispose of Mr. Mallock's one-sided theory. If, in place of the ambiguous phrase "the desire for inequality" is the sole cause of production and consequently of progress, he had said, that there is implanted in man, by a beneficent Creator for just and wise purposes, a laudable spirit of emulation, he would not only have given his Maker some little to do with the development of man, but he would be more apt in time to aid his fellow-man in attaining at least the foundation upon which alone can happiness be developed. For he would have actually admitted what he evidently desires to conceal, and what we claim, that as the acorn has a vital principle within that only requires favorable circumstances to admit of its

development into an oak, so man has a vital impulse to *do* implanted within him, which only requires that the institutions of society shall permit of development to create a growth as grand in results as the magnificent oak bears in comparison to the insignificant acorn. And, too, just as circumstances may impede the development of the acorn or deform its growth, so man by unfortunate environments may be distorted and perverted. And when this is the result in the case of either we hold that it is far more practical to inquire into the effects of these disturbing causes, and to endeavor to modify them so as to produce a given result, than to exhaust volumes and patience in an attempted analysis of this vital force.

The environments in the case of the acorn are soil, moisture and heat. The environments in the case of man are education, good government and competence. To expect a development of the whole species towards those standards that in both cases nature has furnished us occasional examples of in her forest and in the history of man, is simply to take it for granted that God has given us nothing to do in this world in which he has placed us.

To confine our attempts, or to chiefly direct our efforts to improving or changing this vital force, is but to undertake an improvement on first principles, which, strive as we may, we cannot even know how to begin to do.

That theology has devoted its attention for so many ages to this task will sufficiently account for the failure of Theology to effect any but evil results.

That much attention has been given to the environments of man for the last hundred years, is true. But this attention has effected solely two of these circumstances or institutions, education and government. That these two, however highly developed and perfected, are not capable alone of producing the desired result, happiness, is no more strange than would congenial soil and moisture alone suffice to produce of the acorn the oak. Instead of being filled with dismay at the failure of developed government and education to produce the desired end, we should all the more heartily devote our attention to finding, if possible, the other obnoxious causes which by their presence counteract the good that is to be obtained from good government and education.

In this way, and in this way only, is the missing link to be discovered that is necessary to constitute a perfect basis for a practical and successful system of Sociology.

PART I.—VOL. II.

FACTOR EXAMINED.

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

ON THE UNHAPPINESS ARISING FROM POVERTY

LAND, LABOR AND POVERTY IN THEIR RELATION TO HAPPINESS AND PROGRESS.

Material Civilization is a desirable thing for one reason only: It is desirable only because, and in so far as, it increases human happiness.—*W. H. Mallock's Social Equality*, *p.* 197.

THE FACTORS OF CIVILIZATION.

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE INFLUENCE OF POVERTY.

Plato, therefore, calls poverty thievish, sacriligious, filthy, wicked, and mischievous. And well he might. For it makes many an upright man otherwise, had he not been in want to take bribes, to be corrupt, to do against his conscience, to sell his tongue, heart hands, etc;—to be churlish, hard, unmerciful, uncivil; to use indirect means to help his present estate. It makes princes to exact upon their subjects; great men to tyrannize, landlords oppress, justice mercenary, lawyers vultures, physicians harpies, friends importunate, tradesmen liars, honest men thieves, devout assassins, great men to prostitute their wives, daughters and themselves, middle sort to repine, commons to mutiny, all to grudge, murmur and complain.—*Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy, p.* 216.

But it is not enough that a man has a good constitution and a more or less perfect education, if he has not the power to enjoy these blessings by being able to take that exercise, which is equally necessary to his well-being.

And the necessity for this power will be great in proportion as his constitution is strong and vigorous, and in proportion as his intellectual capacity developed by education shall stimulate him to activity:

There are three causes which can debar a man from this exercise of his physical and mental activity:

Superior physical force; disease, and poverty.

The first, except in the cases of criminals, minors and persons of unsound minds, the citizen of a free government need not take into consideration. For it is the very purpose of the constitution of his country to render his freedom absolute in so far as this freedom will not interfere with the equal freedom of every other citizen.

And the degree of success which attends the efforts of statesmen in this direction is the crucial test of the correctness of their political theories.

So the progress of education is supposed to and does lessen his amenabilty to coercion from disease.

And the test of the correctness of medical and surgical theories is the favorable results, in these particulars, that follow medical and surgical practices.

The remaining cause, poverty, is attended to by the political economists; and the test of the correctness of their varying systems is to be found in the practical results that follow the application of their theories.

In each of these departments we will find three things common to them all:

1st.—Some recognized system already in operation in civilized countries in the very beginning of history.

2nd.—Opposition, from those whom interest or ignorance control, to all innovations.

3rd.—A power in each to stand innovation and to profit by it,—provided there is kept in view in each department, in the applications of reforms, systems that are characterized by simplicity to attain results, and equalization of results when obtained.

And the results when accomplished will be found to consist in politics, in an equalization of power in the state, and a constant tendency to universal ability to assume power

among the citizens when the necessity arises,* thus acquainting all with those principles of equality which, if observed, will enable each to avoid being a political slave. And in the science of health, universal knowledge of the cause of sickness and a tendency to universal ability to avoid being sick. So also will follow upon the application of a correct system of political economy, an universal command of the necessities of life, and a tendency to universal control of its luxuries by placing all in the position to *avoid* being poor.

Having premised this much, let us glance at some of the effects of poverty upon the progress and the happiness of man, and we can better determine if that cause has been of such deterient force as to account for much of the misery and wickedness of humanity, without necessitating an appeal to Revelation to explain this wickedness by according it to a "fallen nature," or to "original sin." And we can also better determine if religion and goodness may not be better served by a direct attack on human institutions that beget such results, rather than by a continuation of the pretty well tested method of praying for divine grace to make people good in spite of circumstances, and by the weekly delivery by "ministers of God" of moral platitudes and ineffectual sentimentalities.

The case of the woman who cooked and served her own child during the siege of Jerusalem, as related by Josephus, the instance mentioned of the man and woman who set traps for children and caught and eat them, in Scotland in the fourteenth century, are instances of the extreme debase-

*The main purpose of the people in framing, one hundred years ago, our present system of government, was to have a people's government, in other words, that the people themselves by turns should do the public work, etc.—*Albert Stickney in Scribner's Magazine for July* '81.

ment and cruelty that may be expected to follow upon extreme poverty. Writing of Spain in the seventeenth century, Buckle thus describes the condition of Madrid:

"Many persons fell down in the streets exhausted, and died where they fell; others were seen in the public highways evidently dying, but no one had wherewithal to feed them. At length the people became desperate and threw off all control. In 1680 not only the workmen of Madrid, but large numbers of the tradesmen, organized themselves into bands, broke open private houses, and robbed and murdered the inhabitants in the face of day."

Was this because the people were originally depraved? Was it because they were heathens? No. All this, and worse, transpired in the capital of the most religious country in Europe, in its most religious age, because "the inhabitants of Madrid were starving."

And from instances of these kinds to mere stinginess from lack of the luxuries and necessaries of life, all the intervening vices of theft, treachery and mendacity, prostitution and murder, infanticide, etc., may be found connected with, and consequent upon, poverty.[b]

And these vices will be extreme and common in proportion to the direct pressure of poverty, or to the fear of poverty, or to the desire for wealth.

And this fear of poverty and this desire for wealth will be great in proportion as a one-sided civilization shall render poverty dreadful in itself, and difficult to avoid when once its clutches have grasped its victim, and shall render wealth desirable from the luxuries wealth can bestow, and the applause its possession confers upon the capitalist.

[b]In the dire necessity of famine, they (the Crusaders) sometimes roasted and devoured the flesh of their infant or adult captives.—*Gibbon, Vol. V., p. 47.*

"The natives of New Guinea," says Stone, are not generous," and in the same paragraph he tells us that they are so poor that they cannot be generous, they have nothing to give.[c]

The Khurds, who are considered more dangerous than the Arabs, have nevertheless some good qualities. Grattan Geary thus speaks of them:

"My first actual contact with them was in a field of barley which was being reaped, about half way between Kruffree and Das Hormuttee. As we approached, the four men who were reaping moved off a little distance and watched our movements with attention. A little stream ran close to the field, and we stopped to drink at it. Seeing that we were peaceably disposed, the reapers returned to where they had been at work and sat down to eat their breakfast and look at us.

They had a sheep skin full of buttermilk, and they gave us several pints of that beverage without hesitation, when we approached and asked them for a little; but they shook their heads when we offered payment. This was very different from the mercenary hospitality of the sedentary Arab, who would have asked us for baksheesh if we had not offered it.

Later on I got accustomed to the characteristic of the silent and somewhat surly Khurd, and I never wounded his feelings by offering backsheesh."

If we want an explanation of this generosity which, in the matter of hospitality, characterized these particular Khurds, we find it in the description given by the same writer of their country. He says:

"There is a fine climate, a *fertile soil*, yielding a superabundance of food. Cattle and sheep in immense numbers,

[c]Men in such circumstances cannot be generous. They have too much at stake.—*Macaulay's Essays.*

life on the whole tolerably secure, a hardy and healthy population, fairly industrious, and more food in the land than mouths to eat it."[e]

Teaching the same lesson of the dependence of generosity and humanity upon physical conditions, is Mongo Park's experience in Africa:

"The natives of Bambarra were more generous to me in proportion as they were more opulent than their neighbors."

"Cultivation," continues Park, "was by these natives carried on in a spirited manner, and hunger, as they said, was never known."

To the same effect will be the testimony of all those who have traveled in the Southern States prior to the war, and after it. Before that calamity overtook the Southern people they were never known to tax the stranger within their gates for the obligation that a night's lodging or a meal taken might impose. Since the war, however, it has become common to ask payment for these accommodations, and owing

[e]Writing of the Kamtschatkes, Cochrane says: "They are hospitable truth-loving, honest and amiable. They are established in villages, built in the old Russian style, which are clean and comfortable. * * Few people have more of the necessities of life than the Kamtschatkes." Again he says: "On reaching the Asiatic side of the Ural chain, I could not help remarking that the inhabitants of all the villages were much more civil, more hospitable and more cleanly dressed, and in no one instance would they accept money for the food I had occasion to procure. I never entered a cottage but *shtshee*—a cabbage soup—with meat, bread and milk were immediately placed before me unasked; nor could any entreaty of mine induce them to receive a higher reward than a pipe of tobacco or a glass of *vodka*, (whiskey.) In short, to prevent uselessly troubling the inhabitants, I was obliged to consign my nearly exhausted purse to the care of my knapsack, renouncing the unhackneyed and unsocial custom of paying for food."

somewhat to that "spirit of progress" which unfortunately is more general now than of old, it has become almost a custom for the gentleman who chances to entertain the casual wayfarer to expect, and often to require, payment for that hospitality which it was once his pleasure gratuitously to afford.[1]

It is not pretended that all men who have means are generous and humane, unfortunately we know that this is not the case. But what we do assert is, that in simply constituted societies, hospitality, generosity and humanity are as the means of the people render the practice of these virtues compatible with their own interests, and so-called modern

[1]As showing more clearly the calculating and parsimonious spirit that modern civilization is apt to produce in deadening the spontaneous generosity of natural man, when circumstances allow him to be generous, the following is extracted from Cochrane's Travels in Russia and Siberia: "A traveler in Russia, whether native or foreigner, on taking leave of his friends previous to his departure, uniformly finds at his lodgings all the provisions required for his journey, with another lodging pointed out at some friend's upon his route, for as long as he pleases. Indeed, I have no doubt that a man may travel through the Russian Empire, so long as his conduct is becoming, without wanting anything, not even horses and money, excepting only in the *civilized* parts between the capitals, St. Petersburg and Moscow." The same traveler in writing of the Tartars gives a pleasing description of them and their hospitality. "With a grateful remembrance of the kindness" he had experienced at Tobolsk, Cochrane bade adieu to the city, and traveled in a southerly direction towards the Chinese frontier, up the valley of the Irtish. He passed through many towns which were usually garrisoned by Russian troops, and was entertained at several of the villages of the Tartars of the Bashkir race. The perfect neatness of their houses, whose white plastered chimney and ovens reminded him a little of his own country. their civility and kindness, and the well cultivated appearance of their corn and pasture lands was extremely gratifying to him. He slept contentedly in their clean beds, and partook with keen relish of their milk and cakes."

civilization is better calculated to nullify the spontaneous generosity of a people above want than any other known cause. For our civilization bringing prudence and calculation into the minds of men to a greater extent than ever known before, will check this spontaneous and natural disposition in proportion as the tendency of the system of political economy practiced in civilized countries shall make wealth more desirable and more necessary, and render poverty more and more a matter of causes beyond individual control, and greatly to be dreaded. While, therefore, it will not always follow that a man will be generous and humane in proportion to his means, it is self-evident that to be practicably able to be generous and hospitable a man must have something over and above what his own necessities require, or what, by association of ideas, he thinks is necessary to his personal, his political or social condition.

And the office of the religious man, who is desirous of increasing that spirit from which generosity and hospitality flow, is to find means whereby men may be able to be generous and humane, and thus cultivate to a higher development these noble attributes.

And if this third factor, competence, be neglected, or by the adverse action of an erroneous system of Political Economy, rendered impossible to be obtained by the masses, it will be of little avail what progress may be made in education or in government. For the result of poverty will, sooner or later, nullify the good results that may have been attained by either or both of the other two.

A nation may linger longer having only the one evil to contend with than if the woes arising from all three causes were at once in operation.

But, sooner or later, the poverty of the masses will cause

the ruin of any country, because if the system of political economy adopted in that country is founded on a wrong basis the tendency of the system will be to create only two classes in that country, the very rich and the very poor.

And it may be set down as a fundamental proposition that cannot be too often repeated, that as any system of government is wrong that creates or promotes the power of the few at the expense of the many, as any theological system is wrong that produces, as its result, popes, cardinals and archbishops at one end, and a mass of ignorant devotees at the other; as any system of medicine is wrong that has learned professors at one extreme, characterized by arbitrary technicalities and mysterious symbols, and an ignorant and superstitious rabble at the other; as any system of education is wrong whose exponents devote their time to the solution of metaphysical subtleties, to propounding and resolving immaterial syllogisms, or whose idea of knowledge is limited to the acquisition of the equal ignorance of other people simply because this acquisition necessitates an acquaintance with the languages of classical, or the ceremonies or the literature of contemporary, nations, so, too, will any system of political economy be found erroneous that *culminates* in an occasional Rothschild or Vanderbilt at one extreme and a mass of poverty-stricken tenants, paupers, thieves and prostitutes at the other, with the intermediate classes gradually diminishing, from year to year, and forming a struggling mass of unhappy individuals straining every nerve, and using every means, to attain the opulence of the first or to escape the misery of the last.

That to this condition has our modern system of political economy brought the people of England, France and the United States to-day, those will most readily concede who

are best acquainted with the results in this respect that modern civilization and modern progress have produced in these countries.[8]

A few extracts from the writings of those best conversant with that condition, will show to what extent poverty and all its attending vices are demoralizing and undermining society.

Says Carlyle:

"Wealth has accumulated itself into masses and poverty, also, in accumulation enough, lies impassably separated from it, opposed, uncommunicating, like force in positive and negative poles. The gods of this lower world sit aloft, on glittering thrones, less happy than Epicurus gods, as indolent, as impotent, while the boundless, living chaos of ignorance and hunger welters terrific, in its dark fury, under their feet. How much among us might be likened to a whited sepulchre, outwardly all pomp and strength, but inwardly full of horror, and despair, and dead men's bones!"

"Iron highways, with their wains, fire-winged, are uniting all ends of the firm land, quays and moles, with their innumerable stately fleets tame the ocean into our pliant bearer of burdens, labor's thousand arms of sinew and of metal, all conquering everywhere, from the tops of the mountains down to the depths of the mine and the caverns of the sea, ply unweariedly for the service of man, yet, man remains unserved. He has subdued this planet, his

[8]Mr. William Lewery Blackley, in his review of Prince Bismark's proposed compulsory insurance, states: "That the number of persons exempt in Prussia from *Klassensteuer*, (a sort of poll-tax, modified by rates of earnings,) as not earning more than four hundred and twenty marks a year (say eight shillings and six-pence a week), is about three millions and a half. The number earning from that amount up to seven hundred and fifty marks (say fifteen shillings a week) is about the same number." *See The Contemporary Review, April*, 1881.

habitation and inheritance, yet reaps no profit from his victory."—*Carlyle's Essays, Characteristics.*

"The existing state of society develops in its impure atmosphere innumerable outcasts, whose labor is not merely unproductive, but actually destructive; adventurers, prostitutes, people with no acknowedged means of living, beggars, convicts, swindlers, thieves and others whose numbers tend rather to increase than to diminish."—*M. Considerant.*

"Everywhere you hear the laborer, the artisan, the clerk, complain of his position and his occupation, while they long for the time when they can retire from work imposed upon them by necessity. To be repugnant, to have for its motive and pivots nothing but the fear of starvation, is the great, the fatal, characteristic of civilized labor. The civilized workman is condemned to penal servitude. So long as productive labor is so organized that instead of being associated with pleasure it is associated with pain, weariness and dislike, it will always happen that all will avoid it who are able. With few exceptions those only will consent to work who are compelled to do it by want. Hence the most numerous classes, the artificers of social wealth, the active and direct creators of all comfort and luxury, will always be condemned to touch closely on poverty and hunger; they will always be the slaves to ignorance and degradation; they will continue to be always that huge herd of mere beasts of burden whom we see ill grown, decimated by disease, bowed down in the great work-shop of society over the plow or over the counter, that they may prepare the delicate food, and the sumptuous enjoyments of the upper and idle classes."—*M. Considerant.*

Reviewing extracts similar to these given, which he thinks probably exaggerated, John Stuart Mill says:

"It is impossible to deny that the considerations brought to notice in the preceding chapter make out a frightful case either against the existing order of society, or against the position of man himself in this world. How much of

the evils should be referred to the one, and how much to the other, is the principal theoretic question which has to be resolved."

That is to say, Mr. Mill admits that our civilization is grievous in its results, but whether God is to blame or man for the condition of affairs which he admits, he considers to be the point at issue.

Mr. Mill elsewhere (*Essay on Nature*) seems to think the fault lies with God because of the intractable material he has to work on; Christians think it is God's good pleasure, that these things are all permitted for His glory.

And referring to the same question of the inequality of wealth existing in England, Mr. Ruskin says:

"The first object of all work—not the principal one, but the first and necessary one—is to get food, clothes, lodging and fuel. It is quite possible to have too much of all these things. I know of a great many gentlemen who eat too large dinners; a great many ladies who have too many clothes. I know there is lodging to spare in London for I have several houses there which I can't let. And I know there is fuel to spare everywhere, since we get up steam to pound the roads with, while our men stand idle, or drink till they can't stand, idle or any otherwise. Notwithstanding, there is agonizing distress even in this highly favored England in some classes for want of food, clothes, lodging and fuel."

But this unnatural distress for want of the necessaries of life is not all the evil caused by poverty. The crimes that are most common as any particular nation becomes advanced in civilization, and which are most frequently practiced in the largest and wealthiest cities, the centres of civilization, such as thievery, lying, robbery, prostitution, infanticide, suicide and murder, are the direct results of poverty, or the fear of poverty, or the abnormal desire for wealth, which is

characteristic of our older communities, which desire could only assume this abnormal development in consequence of the dreadful results following upon poverty.

But this enumeration does not embrace all the evils that flow from poverty. To poverty or the fear of poverty, and to the desire for wealth abnormally developed, we owe that competition, that scramble for wealth, which is becoming so marked in our older cities, and which is so prejudicial to what little morality we have remaining, and so unfortunate for the poorer tradesmen, and is becoming so destructive to all sense of honor in some commercial circles.

To enable us to appreciate to what extent this spirit of competition is developed, and what injury it is doing, we will transcribe a passage from Mr. Thomas Hughes' book "Rugby:"

"Are not the older generation, we may ask, bred and born as they were to the business, beginning to get tired if not ashamed of the sore scramble, trampling on one another, throttling one another, which our trade has become? *Laissez faire* and the acknowledged law of self-interest—enlightened and unenlightened—have had full swing, have gone ahead scornfully with their heads in the air these thirty years and upwards and have landed us just here. Our shopkeepers can no longer thrive, even if they can live, except by puffing, and selling shoddy, and treading one another under foot; and the rising generation, at any rate, are sick of such ways of living, are resolved, as far as they are concerned, not to live in these ways."

And if the reader is not prepared on his own observation or on our authority to attribute all these evils to poverty, and to the fear of poverty, perhaps the following from Carlyle's *Past and Present*: Gospel of Mammonism, will dispel his lingering doubts:

"What is his (the Englishman's) hell, after all these reputable, oft-repeated hearsays, what is it? With hesitation, with astonishment, I pronounce it to be the terror of not making money. Is not that a somewhat singular hell? Dig down where you will, through the Parliament floor or elsewhere, how infallibly do you, at spade's depth below the surface, come upon this liar's rock substratum! Much else is ornamental; true, on barrel heads, in pulpits, hustings, parliamentary benches, but this is forever true and truest, 'Money does bring money's worth, put money into your purse.' Here, if nowhere else, is the human soul still in thorough earnest, sincere with a prophet's sincerity. The hell of the English, as Sauerteig said, is the infinite terror of not getting on, especially of not making money."

"And," continues Mr. Hughes, from whose "Rugby" this from Carlyle is taken, "is not the same note sounded throughout our poetry? 'Propputty, propputty, propputty, that's wut I hear 'em saay,' chuckles Tennyson's modern farmer, listening to the music of his horses' feet on the road."

After testimony of this kind from men of such character we will, perhaps, be prepared to allow more weight to the testimony we have every day presented to us in the columns of the press, as to the amount and the effect of competition and poverty in Europe. We find corroboration wherever we turn our eyes of the truth of the following statement: "Competition produces destitution, this is a fact shown by statistics. Destitution is fearfully prolific, this is shown by statistics. The fruitfulness of the poor throws upon society unhappy creatures who have need of work, and cannot find it, this is shown by statistics. At this point society is reduced to a choice between killing the poor or maintaining them gratuitously—between atrocity and folly!"

"Cheapness is advantageous to the consumer at the cost of introducing the seeds of ruinous anarchy among the producers. Cheapness is, so to speak, the hammer with which the rich among the producers crush their poorer rivals. Cheapness is the trap into which the daring speculators entice the hard-workers. Cheapness is the sentence of death to the producer on a small scale, who has no money to invest in the purchase of machinery that his rich rivals can easily procure. Cheapness is the great instrument in the hands of monopoly, it absorbs the small manufacturer, the small shop-keeper, the small proprietor, it is, in one word, the destruction of the middle-class for the advantage of a few industrial oligarchs."

Admitting, then, that we have convinced our readers that poverty is the cause of so many crimes, so much vice, so much misery, and that it is also the cause of all that wretchedness and unhappiness that arises from the ever increasing competition characteristic of our times, and, therefore, by implication responsible for all the evils that follow upon unsuccessful speculations, upon bankruptcy and defalcations which among us are, at times, so alarmingly frequent, they will appreciate the magnitude of the power for evil of this poverty.

But poverty is not only the direct or indirect cause of all these evils that we have mentioned, but it is to poverty that we owe, in many instances, bad government and ignorance. And, consequently, the majority of all these evils that we have shown[b] to be the results of these two causes, can also be laid to the charge of poverty.

So we see what vast issues are at stake, dependent

[b]See Factors of Civilization, Vol. I, chapters vii and viii.

upon the happy solution of this problem of the ages, the cause, the necessary, ultimate cause of poverty.

Our last assertion is so broad and sweeping that it may be well to examine into the reasons the contemplation of which has produced that conviction in our mind.

In the first place, if we modify our previous definition of government, as comprising all systems of law and all customs regulating the relations existing between people and their rulers, between man and wife, between master and slave, or between employer and employe[1], so as to reduce government to represent the economic and political relations existing between the adult males of a community, we have in a more compact form the conventional definition of government. Now it is evident that man existing before government, the sympathetic relations existed before the political, and that, therefore, there may be and has doubtless been more or less friendship and intercourse existing between individuals before the idea of government was generated among them. But these affections or ties that existed before the government was formulated, do not constitute a government. Impelled by affection or by ties of consanguinity, or by hope of reward, one savage or barbarian may help another savage or barbarian to attack or repel the attacks of others.

But whenever this is done from motives or causes like these alone, we cannot say that, in a political sense, they have a government.

But whenever, by the outside pressure of enemies, or inside pressure of famine, or other cause, the individuals of a tribe agree to act in concert, agree to discharge certain duties toward each other, then a government is born. And all

[1]See Factors of Civilization, Vol. I,—chapter vii.

advance in governments consists in making the *duties* of each, whether chief or simple citizen, as light as is consistent with the safety and the prosperity of all the other members. And, whenever from any cause the relations of each member to the government shall be changed, permanently changed, that government is taking the first steps toward future anarchy or future despotism. Government, then, may be understood to mean a collection of people bound to each other by certain more or less well defined reciprocal *duties*.

Before this stage of development a people may be bound by ties of blood, or of friendship, or of contiguity, or of mutual interest, but government only commences when the idea of duty enters into the compact.

Therefore when we hear a man say, as is often said, that "any government is better than no government," it is evident that he is mistaken. He only means that any organized government, bad within certain limits, is better than an anarchal state of society. But anarchy is not synonymous with "no government", though the terms are used as if they were interchangeable.

By "no government" we understand a condition of society before the idea of reciprocal duties has entered the minds of the units of that society. *A community with potential governmental force, but with that force undeveloped and quiescent.*

By anarchy we understand a society with actual governmental forces developed, *but with those forces acting in opposition.*

Now, taking two tribes of savages, the one living quietly hunting or planting, and the other from a rigid climate or uncongenial soil, deprived of the necessities of life. Of the two tribes, both being in the same grade of development, each as ignorant, and therefore less aspiring, less ambitious

than it would be if possesed of some education,—the poor tribe will be the one who will march upon those more fortunately situated; and thus will massacres, rapine and war be the results of poverty. In addition to the bloodshed and misery, direct and indirect, arising from war and battle, the conquerors will either, emboldened by their success, continue their depredations among other tribes, or will settle down in the fertile lands of the conquered, and will make these last serve them as their exigencies require or as their caprices dictate. Thus slavery originated in many instances. Slavery is the result of poverty, and not poverty the necessary result of emancipation, as M. De Cassagnac so ingeniously argues.[J]

But not only will slavery be the result, but the conquerors will in time divide against themselves, and with the growing wealth of the country will endeavor to curtail the number of the beneficiaries, or to absorb in themselves all the emoluments and honor to be derived from the labor or from the homage of the common people. Thus orignated anarchy, tyranny, despotism, and all the misery and unhappiness that has resulted from them.

We make this outline brief because the relations which poverty bears to tribal inroads and invasions, and to formation of subjects of the conquered people, and to the origin of slavery, are well understood by those of our readers who have had time and inclination to study the origin of governments, of plebians and of slaves, and because the relations are so evident they need only be hinted to be fully seen by those whose pursuits have not left them leisure for such investigations.

[J]History of the Working and Burgher Classes—Ben. E. Green's translation.

In regard to our other proposition, that ignorance is the child of poverty, we will let Buckle explain in his own words the dependence of the one upon the other:

"Of all the results which are produced among a people by their climate, food and soil, the accumulation of wealth is the earliest and in many respects the most important, for although the progress of knowledge eventually accelerates the increase of wealth, it is nevertheless certain that, in the first formation of society, the wealth must accumulate before the knowledge can begin. As long as every man is engaged in collecting the materials necessary for his own subsistence, there will be neither leisure nor taste for higher pursuits; no science can possibly be created, and the utmost that can be effected will be an attempt to economize labor by the contrivance of such rude and imperfect instruments as even the most barbarous people are able to invent.

"In a state of society like this, the accumulation of wealth is the first great step that can be taken, because without wealth there can be no leisure, and without leisure there can be no knowledge. If what a people consume is always exactly equal to what they possess, there will be no residue, and therefore, no capital being accumulated, there will be no means by which the unemployed classes may be maintained. * * * * Thus it is that of all the great social improvements the accumulation of wealth must be the first, because without it there can be neither taste nor leisure for that acquisition of knowledge on which, as I shall hereafter prove, the progress of civilization depends. * * * In Asia civilization has always been confined to that vast tract where a rich and alluvial soil has secured to man that wealth without some share of which no intellectual progress can begin. This great region extends, with a few interruptions, from the east of southern China to the western coasts of Asia Minor, of Phœnicia, and of Palestine. To the north of this immense belt there is a long line of barren country which has invariably been peopled by rude and wandering tribes, who are kept in poverty by the ungenial nature of

the soil, and who, as long as they remained on it, have never emerged from their uncivilized state. How entirely this depends on physical causes is evident from the fact that these same Mongolian and Tartarian hordes have, at different periods, founded great monarchies in China, in India, and in Persia, and have, on all such occasions, attained a civilization nowise inferior to that possessed by the most flourishing of the ancient kingdoms. For in the fertile plains of southern Asia nature has supplied all the materials of wealth, and there it was that these barbarous tribes acquired for the first time some degree of refinement, produced a national literature, and organized a national polity, none of which things they, in their native land, had been able to effect. In the same way the Arabs in their own country have, owing to the extreme aridity of their soil, always been a rude and uncultivated people; for in their case, as in all others, great ignorance is the fruit of great poverty. But in the seventh century they conquered Persia; in the eighth century they conquered the best part of Spain; in the ninth century they conquered the Punjaub, and eventually the whole of India. Scarcely were they established in their fresh settlements when their character seemed to undergo a great change. They, who in their original land were little else than roving savages, were now for the first time able to accumulate wealth, and, therefore, for the first time did they make some progress in the arts of civilization. In Arabia they had been a mere race of wandering shepherds; in their new abodes they became the founders of mighty empires, they built cities, endowed schools, collected libraries, and the traces of their power are still to be seen at Cordova, at Bagdad, and at Delhi.

"Precisely in the same manner there is adjoining Arabia at the north, and only separated from it elsewhere by the narrow waters of the Red sea, an immense sandy plain, which, covering the whole of Africa in the same latitude, extends westward until it reaches the shores of the Atlantic. This enormous tract is, like Arabia, a barren waste, and

therefore, as in Arabia, the inhabitants have always been entirely uncivilized, acquiring no knowledge, simply because they have accumulated no wealth. But this great desert is in its eastern part, irrigated by the waters of the Nile, the overflowing of which covers the sand with rich alluvial deposit, that yields to labor the most abundant and, indeed, the most extraordinary returns. The consequence is that wealth in that spot was rapidly accumulated, the accumulation of knowledge followed, and this narrow strip of land became the seat of Egyptian civilization; a civilization which, though grossly exaggerated, forms a striking contrast to the barbarism of the other nations of Africa, none of which have been able to work out their own progress, or emerge in any degree from the ignorance to which the penury of nature has doomed them."[k]

But, while the contemplation of the results of poverty on this grand scale is both interesting and instructive, it is not necessary for us to attempt to pursue the manifold ramifications it pursues through the history of civilization.

Our object is more simple. We desire to treat of poverty only as it presents itself in societies that have become possessed of education and refinement.

That poverty which is a result of civilization, which is most apparent where society is most advanced, and which is peculiarly pernicious just in proportion as it keeps pace with education and luxury.

Poverty of this kind is the object of our attention. Its necessary cause has been for several years our incessant study, its cure is the object of our sincerest desire.

Of all the dreadful results that follow upon civilization, probably the most lamentable is prostitution Of the dependence upon poverty of this fruitful cause of misery and unhappiness it seems hardly necessary to expatiate. But

[k]History of Civilization in England, Vol. I., p. 33.

as our purpose is to show that all evil is the result of circumstances and conditions, and not at all, primarily, dependent upon a "fallen nature," it is necessary that we treat every subject we touch upon in such a manner as to make our proposition stand self-sustained by an array of facts impossible to refute or deny. And as to the dependence upon poverty of the social evil, the following extracts from recognized authorities on that subject will be conclusive:

"Poverty is an integral part of nearly *all the conditions of life* which we have to consider as incentives to prostitution. In some instances, more, perhaps, than may be generally credited, poverty is a direct and proximate cause of this vice. In other words, 'women *previously and otherwise virtuous* do prostitute themselves for bread."

"In most of the cases enumerated, except that purely natural but *rare* one—innate sexual desire, poverty is a remote cause. From the number of the human race who are under its griping, chilling pressure, poverty may be set down as a fruitful source of prostitution."

"The connection of political circumstances with the phases of public morals is more intimate than the consideration of the superficial differences of the two matters would at first sight imply. But an attentive comparison of the state of public prosperity with the state of public crime will show that crime is somewhat dependent on food; the man with a well filled stomach is no foe to order. Prostitution, as a means of supplying the cravings of hunger, is part of the same connection."[l]

We have seen that the cure for bad government is to be found in a constitutional, democratic form of government.[m] We know that the cure for ignorance consists in the acquisition of knowledge, in finding out "the relations that things

[l]Sanger's History of Prostitution, p. 326.

[m]Factors of Civilization, Vol. I., Chap. VII.

and ideas bear to each other and to themselves," and in emerging thereby from that condition of deprivation of knowledge which is ours when we are born.

And this is to be obtained not by learning foreign languages,[n] in acquiring the art or practice of music, in being able to paint more or less pictures more or less badly. These are serviceable in educating us only when in their pursuit we add to our stock of knowledge. Otherwise, they are pretty accomplishments, more or less useful, laudable in those who can afford their pursuit or their acquirement, but accomplishments only, and sometimes very misplaced and depreciating accomplishments at that. But we do not know the cure for poverty. That this evil has an antidote, however, we may well conclude, both from the eternal fitness of things and from the success that has, in some measure, attended our attempts to cure ignorance and bad government.

To that cure our attention will be directed later. Just here we only wish to state the case, draw attention to some of the evil results that follow upon its existence, and say that civilization, as civilization is now by us understood, can never cure, will never eliminate, this evil; for poverty, as presented to us, is the result of modern civilization, and increases as this civilization advances in age, luxury and wealth.

Having, then, established our proposition by induction, that our present system of Political Economy is founded on

[n] Education is more generally diffused in Hungary than in any other European nation, and scarcely a village is destitute of schools; yet the system is so wretched and the political and general knowledge of the peasants so low, that although often able to read or write in two or three *different languages*, their *general knowledge* is far less than that of the English peasant, who, not unfrequently, cannot write his own name.—*Spencer's Travels in Hungary.*

a wrong basis, since it has produced these pernicious and lamentable results before mentioned, it only remains, before we proceed to the further consideration of the subject, to ascertain what Christianity has done to prevent or to eliminate poverty.

Says Mr. Gregg, in writing of the influence of the Church for good:

"It would be rash to say that, on a balance of considerations, the Church and the clergy of all denominations have, in the course of ages, done more harm than good to the Christian world, but probably it would be rasher still to assert the contrary. Certain it is, that in many most material points they have worked counter to the progress of mankind in material and social welfare, and in those departments of moral improvement which spring therefrom. They have inculcated alms-giving on the rich, and (by implication at least in the matters of early marriages) improvidence on the poor, and have thus been the abettors of incalculable mischief. And they have been able to quote texts in defense of both misteachings. To the rich they have said, 'Give to him that asketh of thee;' to the poor, 'Take no thought for the morrow, for the morrow shall take thought of the things of itself.' * * * * The entire *theory* of the Church is antagonistic to any concentrated or consistent scheme for raising the earthly condition of the suffering masses, and if practice, in this respect, has been sounder than theory, the manifest inconsistency of the two has introduced the further evil of a fearful and fundamental insincerity."[o]

Says Sir R. D. Hanson, Chief Justice of South Australia:

"To improve the moral or physical aspect of society was (therefore) no part of the Christian scheme."[p] "We are to

[o]Enigmas of Life, p. 41, by W. R. Gregg.

[p]The History of Jesus, p. 13, by Sir E. D. Hanson, Chief Justice of South Australia, referred to by W. R. Gregg in his Enigmas of Life, p. 42.

renounce this world, to lay up no treasures here. Riches are the root of evil; the elements of progress and civilization are matters of secondary moment." "Our task here is to endeavor, by patience, humility, repentance, faith in the Redeemer, and through the efficacy of the sacraments of the Church, to secure eternal happiness in heaven. This is the assumption of the Church. If it be correct, the more zealous the clergy are, and the more faithful in the discharge of their duty, the more will they endeavor to withdraw attention from what concerns the temporal interests of those committed to their charge, in order to fix it the more steadily on that which alone, if the Church's theory be true, is of real worth—the securing of their happiness in a future life.[q] * * * * Startling as the avowal must appear, we can hardly help arriving at the conclusion that the Church has been rather a hindrance than a helper in the great business of humanity; and that she is, in a great degree, responsible for the fact that so small progress has been made."[r]

To the same effect is the testimony of Edward Denison, a man who devoted his life to the study and amelioration of the poverty of London:

[q] "The Problem of the World and the Church," by a Septuagenarian, p. 7, quoted by W. R. Gregg in Enigmas of Life, p. 45."

[r] See also the opinion of Llewellyn Davies, (*Contemporary Review*, Jan'y, 1871,) and the following opinion of the "*Churchman*:" "The Church has a most important mission, says the *Churchman*, in *softening* down the contrasts which are daily growing wider between the rich and the poor, between the successful and the unsuccessful runners in the race for earthly prizes. Nearly every man is a seeker for this or that form of worldly good, but of that vast number of contestants only a few receive any sort of crown. This is a social necessity. Not every man who voted and worked for the election of President Garfield can be rewarded with an office. Nor can there be an equal distribution of wealth. It is impossible to bring all classes either up or down to the level and keep them there. These outward distinctions which so puzzle and enrage the advocates for social notice and equality, if obliterated to-day would manifest

"*In charity, as in education, the supreme evil has been religion*, not true religion, not that love which is the fulfilling of the law, but that vile devil coined counterfeit which the so-called religious world has stamped with its hell-mark, and agrees to receive as legal tender in place of the true metal."

Says De Cassagnac:

"In four thousand years ancient civilization had not cast upon society enough freedmen to clog and obstruct it; while in less than three centuries Christianity had multiplied them, with so much political improvidence, and such charitable profusion, that these poor people, turned over prematurely to themselves in the midst of a disordered and selfish world, of which they had no experience, found themselves in their isolation in a frightful misery. It was, in fact, from the three first centuries of the Christian era, that beggars abounded in Europe, a phenomenon until then unseen, and full of fearful menaces, which alas! have been too fully realized."[r]

And the same writer after devoting seven years to the study of the cause of poverty and vices said, writing in 1837:

themselves again to-morrow." Continues the *Churchman:* "These same contrasts of condition existed in Christ's day. The rich and poor, the favored and the unfortunate together, made up the world into which He came preaching the beatitudes and the kingdom of God. He did not attempt to reform or to reorganize the existing social condition, or to obliterate the outward inequalities of the people. He never intimated that life's rewards and compensations are all to come this side of the grave. Without bridging over the external distinctions which stood like great chasms between the several classes of people, without trying to level the barriers of casts which the world had built up he sought to knit all ranks and conditions together by the bonds of spiritual unity. He taught what both the winners and the losers of earthly good need to remember, that from an eternal point of view, it makes comparatively little difference what position we hold in this world. The real issues of life hang not upon what we have, but what we are."

[r]History of the Working and Burgher Classes, p. 124.

"Christianity has positively no social significance or progressive value, except this, that it brought to society the doctrine of equality, which before had never existed anywhere, neither among the Jews nor among the Gentiles."

But as we have seen[s] by references to Guizot and Gibbon that the spirit of equality was introduced into European civilization by the "barbarians" and was not a characteristic of Christianity—political equality, that is;—we may read the passage in the light of the authority of the two historians mentioned—"Christianity has positively no social significance or progressive value."

But, not only has the theory of the Church been wrong in the matter of the importance of wealth, not only has her practice in economical matters been pernicious in results, but to all this, she presented in her wealth in the days of her power a glaring contrast to the poverty which she so strongly recommended to others.[t]

[s]See Factors of Civilization, Vol. I--Chap. VII.

[t]The strict legislations which have been framed by the wisdom of modern legislators to restrain the wealth and avarice of the clergy, may be originally deduced from the example of the Emperor Valentinian. His edict, addressed to Damascus, Bishop of Rome, was publicly read in the churches of the city. He admonished the ecclesiastics and monks not to frequent the houses of widows and virgins; and menaced their disobedience with the animadversions of the civil judge. The director was no longer permitted to receive any gift, or legacy, or inheritance from the liberality of his spiritual daughters: every testament contrary to this edict was declared null and void; and the illegal donation was confiscated to the use of the treasury. By a subsequent regulation it would seem that the same provisions were extended to nuns and bishops; and that all persons of the ecclesiastical order were rendered incapable of receiving any testamentary gifts and strictly confined to the natural and legal rights of inheritance. As the guardian of domestic happiness and virtue, Valentinian applied this severe remedy to the growing evil.—*Gibbon —Vol. II. p.* 431.

And however good her intentions (admitting for the sake of argument, that they were good) in the first instance, or how much of this wealth she owed to circumstances she could not control, such as voluntary bequests, legacies, etc., the fact remains that in promulgating the one, or accepting the other, she was acting only as a human institution.

Or we must accept the alternative that a divinely founded and a divinely inspired body, while having so much and such positive information to give us on the creation of the world in six days—on the excesses and the successes of Noah,—on the adventures of Jonah,— on the procession of the spirit,—on the number of natures in Christ,—on justification and sanctification,—had no information to impart that would enable us to reduce somewhat the number of the causes which made us such "miserable sinners." No hint as to the true way to extirpate poverty; no prophecy or information of new worlds, nor of machinery; nor of the thousand inventions that have such potency for good.

In regard to the matter of poverty, no remedy other than the giving of alms was ever inculcated by her in her character as a Church. And charity was born ages before her advent.

The instincts of the good founders and of the good people of the Church have, however, been on the side of mercy. And suffering humanity owes much to that spirit of charity which identified itself with the Church, and thus by organization was kept alive amidst the desolation of those ages she herself was so instrumental in rendering desolate. In keeping alive that spirit of charity, which she has done so much to render necessary, and whose practices of charity, however detrimental when it took the form of alms-giving from her hands, and however ineffectual to accomplish any permanent

good under her directions, and however insufficient to promote a progress which she did nothing to originate, has at least served to show that even in the Catholic Church, even in the middle ages, the nature of man had so much of latent goodness within it, that under all these tremendous disadvantages, amidst all the corruptions of the times, it still retained enough of the divine essence to enable human nature to cling to an organization which promised that, with their co-operation, love and peace and plenty would abound; and yet with so much of common sense as to resist the tendencies of the dogmas of that Church, the spirit of her anchorites, and the teachings of her theologians.

But the impotence of good intentions to produce happy results, when the right spirit is expended in wrong methods, can find no better illustration than in this very matter of the results of charity as practiced by the Church. For those ages when her power was most supreme, and during the time in which she claims that the practice of charity was most universal, were particularly noticeable for the growing and abject poverty of the recipients of charity, and the amazing and ever increasing wealth of the donors. Every country of Europe has found it necessary to confiscate the riches of the Church, and to limit her rights in the matter of accumulating wealth. The single example of Scotland will suffice to show to what extent the Church had monopolized the wealth and the means of wealth in that nation. "In the sixteenth century," says Buckle, "the value of the Church property in Scotland was equal to that of all the rest of the property of the people." Not only does history inform us that property is highly valued by all religious bodies in any civilized country, Pagans and Christians were alike in this matter, as in many others, but it also tells us

that any country that has ever made any considerable advance in knowledge and liberty has been forced by the necessities of circumstance to obtain by force or artifice the bulk of the accumulated wealth of the clergy from their reluctant and protesting hands. But not only has the theory of the Church in matters of political economy been an erroneous one, being always directed to the amelioration rather than to the prevention of poverty, not only has its actual history and the position it has occupied in relation to wealth been a suspicious and unfortunate one, but in those countries that had obtained any degree of civilization prior to its introduction, and which were most prosperous before its advent, when Christianity had nothing to introduce but dogma and creed, ritual and cross, faith and good intentions,[u] the invariable result has been the expulsion of her ministers because of the mischief their presence and practices entail, or ruin and desolation where they were allowed to remain.

The condition of the people of Peru before the introduction of Christianity was certainly, in many respects, not all that could be desired. But whatever the shortcomings of this nation in political or educational matters, poverty at least was unknownto them; and few who have studied at all the condition of Peru and of the Peruvians prior to the era of poverty and conversions inaugurated by their Christian conquerers, but will agree that the condition of the people of that country has been rendered in every respect far worse than before that event.

[u] "In the first years of Christianity the Christians embodied themselves in a form of communism, which operated powerfully to promote social sympathies amongst themselves, and contributed much to their offensive and defensive strength. Since this period Christianity has never established, to our knowledge, any method of a secular nature so practical and wise and so adapted to foster the growth of a sect or young community."

Says Hassaurek in his "Four Years Among Spanish-Americans:"

"Ruin and decay, stagnation and indolence, ignorance and superstition, idleness and civil wars, are the causes which blight more than one-half of the American Continent as far as the Spanish tongue is spoken."

And that these causes enumerated are but secondary ones, dependant on some underlying, primary cause, is attested by the fact that no such evils, superstition perhaps alone excepted, existed under the sway of the Incas.

That the Church has been charitable we will not deny. This attribute Christians possesses by virtue of their humanity, but as to the great charity it exercised during the middle ages, to which the Church so continually refers as one of the proofs of its divine character, the following extract from Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations will account for much of its practices in this respect, without necessitating an explanation of its charity in a supernatural origin:

"Over and above the rents of those estates, the clergy possessed in the tithes a very large portion of the rents of all the other estates in every kingdom of Europe. The revenues arising from both those species of rents were, the greater part of them, paid in kind, in corn, wheat, cattle, poultry, etc. The quantity exceeded greatly what the clergy could themselves consume, and there were neither arts nor manufactures for the produce of which they could exchange the surplus. The clergy could derive advantage from this immense surplus in no other way than by employing it, as the great barons employed the like surplus from their revenues, in the most profuse hospitality, and in the most extensive charity. Both the hospitality and the charity of the ancient clergy accordingly are said to have been very great."—*Book V., Chap. I., p.* 336

But waving the arguments that could be made against a

charity, that might have been in a great measure necessitated by the character the Church claimed for itself in this particular, and that public opinion perhaps demanded, and which entailed so little of sacrifice on the alms givers, it matters not how disinterested or how earnest the Church may have inculcated her precepts of charity, nor how universal or single minded was her practice in this respect, what we have to do with in judging the Church is the result; not a result that culminated in spite of the Church, but one which has been a result most conspicuous where and when the Church has been most powerful, and when her injunctions have been most strenuously obeyed. This only is to be regarded in forming our estimate of the value of the Church as a factor in advancing the science of political economy, in eliminating and preventing poverty, in developing those industrial pursuits which she might have seen had she been even partly and but feebly inspired, were necessary to produce good results.

To give alms to a beggar is no more the right method to adopt in order to cure poverty and create a self-sustaining population, than the practice of giving every boy, who might be struggling with a sum in arithmetic, the right answer before he had found it out for himself by his own effort would be the right method to adopt in order to make of that boy an educated man. The giving of alms and the building of churches in which to preach alms-giving, is no more the right method to adopt in order to produce a nation of well-to-do citizens, than would the conferring of the suffrage or of offices indiscriminately and suddenly on the ignorant rabble be the right method to adopt in creating a nation of American sovereigns. Give the boy his books and his slate, (in other words, make his surroundings favorable

to the end in view,) let him learn, or if necessary, teach him his rules, and he will, sooner or later, acquire his own education, and in the very solving of these initial sums he will be qualifying himself to work out, unassisted, other and more difficult problems. Give the freedman or the ignorant foreigner his State or National Constitution, and equal rights before the law, and they will soon learn to be intelligent voters, and the very exercise of their mental capacity, which they will be obliged to make in order to accomplish this much of a political education, will enable them in time, will qualify them, should occasion arise, to take their places in the councils of the Nation.

It was because of this ignorance or disregard of the dependence of morals and of happiness upon external conditions (and notably upon the possession of competency) that caused the error that both Christians and Stoics made in their respective philosophies of life, of good and of evil.

And to this ignorance or this disregard of this fundamental truth, *that man is good or bad as his surroundings are good or bad*,[v] is due the conspicuous failure of both to produce that good which their purity of intentions authorized them to expect.

The whole teachings of the Church, and of all Churches, has been not how to remove poverty, but has wasted its vital force in endeavoring to find or to produce some occult power that will make man generous and good in *spite of poverty*.[w]

[v] And not as Mr. Spencer supposes that evil exists from non-adaptation of character to circumstances.

[w] "On the other hand the "Orthodox" Church possesses an authority which decides upon them (questions touching upon morals) in the sense least favorable to natural inclinations." Future of the Russian Church, Rev. Father Cæsarius Tondini, p. 17.

This was also the mistake of Epictetus. He says men are like dogs, playful and generous when there is nothing at stake between them to be fought for. But let some one throw a bone to these playful and generous dogs and we will see them immediately fighting for its possession. Therefore, the necessity for a philosophy which would induce man to fix his attention upon the gods, and upon virtuous abstractions, and would enable him to despise the trivial affairs of life.

So Mr. Mallock. The philosophy of Altruism, he says, is all well enough when men are in comfortable circumstances and have no necessities to be egoist. Two *bon vivants* will be generous and each yield to the other, if each is assured that there is enough for both. But let either see that there is only enough for one—what then? Why, then, unless one, or both, of these gentlemen is imbued with the spirit of Christian self-denial, there will be a struggle for possession.[x]

[x] An error not confined to ancient philoshphers, nor to theologians, ancient or modern, but held by many earnest and good men whose thoughts on the subject of evil and good are not guided by biblical authority. As, witness the expression of Mr. Ruskin, quoted in another place in this work, and the following from M. Ernest Renan's essay, "The Future of Religion:" "The religious question of the future is thus found to be exceedingly limited. No great, wholly original creation of religion will have its birth in our civilization. Attempts, after the Saint Simonian sort, rest on a misconception. They would give the name of religion to social well-being, industry, things that have nothing to do with religion."—*Religious History and Criticism*, p. 353. It is true St. Simon was wrong if he said social well-being, industry, etc., constituted religion. But M. Renan is equally in error in saying that these are things that have nothing to do with religion. A good soil is not fruit, but as a good soil is necessary to produce fruit, we hold that social well-being is necessary to enable religion to manifest itself in tangible and permanent form. It has been because of the non-recognition, or denial of this rela-

The true philosopher will, on the contrary, exert himself to see that there is enough for both, for by so doing he not only maintains the pleasant associations existing, but encourages and developes this good feeling and strengthens it, and thereby enables men to become acquainted with the good qualities of each other, and thus lays the foundation for future attachments and reciprocal favors and affections.

But the question of poverty not only includes generosity and humanity, but in the happy solution of this problem will be found the solution of very many other evils which have caused and have added to the sum of human woes and human wickedness.

Who are they who die the soonest and in such greatly disproportionate numbers? The poor, and the children of the

tion, that has produced, after so many years of earnest effort on the part of the Church, such lame results, and will enable us to understand why. "It was a thing of old occurrence," says Ranke, (*History of the Popes, p.* 64,) that the institution of the Church should yield to the growth of worldly tendencies." Lacking this basis it is little wonder that all systems, both theological and secular, have ended in failure to attain the end desired. Reason working on false data will always produce pernicious results.

And in attempting to accomplish this by positive and practical methods, we necessarily become sociologists. And any conflict that may ensue between the methods of sociology and theology to produce this result, it should be borne in mind is a conflict involving *methods* only. The object of both parties is the same---the happiness of man. Theologians postponing the time when this happiness is to be realized, and rational sociol ogists insisting that for such an object, the happiness of man, earth is as well adapted as heaven, and, in fact, only requires that this should be accomplished to make earth heaven. They do not deny or object to the existence of heaven, they see in that existence, however, no reason why this earth may not be rendered beautiful also. Because we may be allotted a palace to live in in the future is no reason why we should not make our present cottage as lovely as possible.

poor. Who are they who constitute the tramps of the country and the joyless occupants of our crowded tenement houses? The poor. From whose ranks are our prisons recruited and our jails supplied? From the ranks of the poor. Who are they who are occasionally used to vindicate by their deaths the majesty of the law? The wretched, the pitiable poor. From whence comes our murderers, habitual drunkards, wife beaters and robbers? From the ever increasing legions of the poor. From whose ranks is society supplied with those unhappy women, who are such a reproach to our civilization, such a rebuke to our political economists, whose systems have produced them, and such a reflection on that degenerate Christianity, which, passing for religion, has proved itself impotent to prevent the evil, and too uncharitable to forgive a "sin" that, in the majority of instances, was caused by the love, the tenderness or the simplicity of the victim?[z] From the ranks of the miserable, the discon-

[z] M. Duchatelet made careful inquiries into the causes of prostitution. He admits that the difficulty of obtaining trustworthy information on this head being very great, many errors may have found their way into his calculations. He gives them, however, for what they are worth:

Want	1441
Expulsion from home or desertion of parents	1255
Desire to support old and infirm parents	37
" " " younger brothers, sisters or nephews and nieces	29
Widows with families to support	23
Girls from the country to support themselves	280
" " " " brought to Paris by soldiers, clerks, students, etc	404
Servants seduced by masters and abandoned	289
Concubines abandoned by their lovers	1425
Total	5183

—*Sanger's History of Prostitution*, p. 141. It will be seen by the above table that all the causes enumerated above, except possibly the last, are reduceable to poverty as the first cause of departure from virtue.

solate poor. For the divine injunction, "Go and sin no more, thy sins are forgiven thee," modern Christian society practically says, "Thy sins are not forgiven thee, and we have rendered it impossible for you to subsist except by shame—go and sin no more." Many indeed, of these last mentioned unfortunates are from the richest classes, those whom our civilization pampers and wines, but to whom modern "culture" has no healthy, natural and intellectual and moral progressive occupations to offer.

Some are the wives and sisters of those who are ruined by unsuccessful speculation or commercial competition, who, because of a false idea of what constitutes "gentility" and "respectability," cannot descend to toil to obtain an honest subsistence.

But this interdependence of medical and legal and moral results upon each other, and all upon poverty, should be our glad assurance of a better day in store for humanity, for as there has been found a method which, if adopted, culminates in educated men, and in a self-governing community, so there will be discovered ere long a method of political economy which, if adopted, will only require that the poor man be furnished tools and material upon which to labor, to work out his financial salvation.

To the consideration of such a system that will produce such favorable economic and moral results, a subsequent chapter of this book will be devoted. It is enough here to say that as there is no royal road to learning, no royal road to the acquisition of a political education, so there should be no royal, free road to wealth.

In each particular department of life what there is of good in either must be attained by each individual for himself; knowledge or education by observation and study; political

qualification by observation, experience and reflection; wealth by all these, supplemented by labor and economy.

And as the exercise of official functions by an ignoramus, which require an educated man to properly discharge, will always breed disorder and troubles, and as the exercise by an ignorant politician of the duties of State that only a skilled statesman should undertake to perform, will produce unfortunate complications and precipitate calamities; so wealth in the hands of those who have not acquired it legitimately, that is, by personal labor, intellectual or manual, or by these combined, will always produce evil in any community that is so unfortunate as to have much wealth in the hands of those who did not acquire it by their own honest exertions. And in all cases the goodness or the badness of their intentions in the use of the same will be no measure of the evil that will ensue. It will be certain that bad ultimate results will follow their actions, irrespective of their motives.

And when the correct system upon which to base our ideas and practices of our politico-economic laws shall be adopted, we will not only get the benefit of that system, but those other influences and factors which are so essential to produce complete happiness and virtue and secure a perfect development, will all prove allies to each other. They will mutually support and strengthen and advance education and liberty, and thus as a consequence morality will be allowed to grow and bear fruit in religion.

And in testing that method *a priori*, the same test we have used to prove the correctness of the right kind of education[aa] to be adopted, the same that we have used in finding what constituted the correct form of government,[bb] we must apply also to this third essential factor.

[aa] See Factors of Civilzation, Vol. I, Chap. VIII.

[bb] See Factors of Civilization, Vol. I, Chap. VII.

And of all methods proposed, that one is to be selected to which this *a priori* test will best apply, viz.: simplicity of methods to obtain the result desired, and which system, when obtained, will have a tendency to secure *equal opportunities* to all of obtaining competence, and the recognition of the rights of all to free access to the fundamental necessities of wealth, whose proper use will culminate in securing competency for each, and therefore, prosperity for all.

CHAPTER X.

THE CAUSE OF POVERTY.

"When I set forth in the pursuit of truth, I found that the best way was to reject everything I had hitherto received and pluck out all my old opinions, in order that I might lay the foundations of them afresh."—*Descartes.*

Having now obtained a tolerably clear idea of the dependence of vice and misery, and unhappiness generally, upon poverty, it becomes a matter of much importance to us who are trying to find why unhappiness and vices linger so persistently among us, and why happiness and virtue do not keep pace with progress, to learn the cause of this poverty. Whether it is because of the impotence of God, as Mr. Mill more than suggests, and as Mr. Gregg intimates[a], or because of His providential decree, and for the furtherance of His power and glory, as theologians have from time immemorial openly declared, or whether it is permitted, as some think, in order to increase our sympathetic virtues; or, finally, if it is due to the ignorance of man.

[a] We have only to conceive the Creator *inmeasurably, incalculably* wise, beneficient and mighty—good and powerful to a degree which, in reference to human beings, may fairly be called infinite, but still 'conditioned'—hampered, it may be, by the attributes, qualities, imperfections of the material on which he had to operate; bound possibly by laws or properties inherent in the nature of that material, and we descend, so to speak, into a breathable, intellectual atmosphere at once.—*Enigmas of Life*, p. 18—Preface.

Regarding the idea that had at one time many adherents, (now remaining only Mr. Mallock) that poverty was imposed by God upon humanity to secure a necessary and harmonious subordination of society, it is sufficient to say that there can be subordination without poverty. Subordination may exist in a school-room where the children are influenced by generous emulation, the sense of decorum and the love of the teacher, as in an almshouse, where subordination is secured by the fear of poverty. Subordination may exist in a patriot army as well as in a band of robbers; in the family of a happy home as on a plantation. And as to the idea of subordination necessitated by imperfection of parts, that is fully answered by Dr. Johnson. He says:

"In all this there is nothing that can silence the inquiries of curiosity, or calm the perturbations of doubt. Whether subordination implies imperfection may be disputed. The means, respecting themselves, may be as perfect as the end. The weed as a weed is no less perfect than the oak as an oak. That *imperfection implies evil and evil suffering*, is by no means evident. Imperfection may imply private evil, or the absence of some good, but this privation produces no suffering, but by the help of knowledge. An infant at the breast is yet an imperfect man, but there is no reason for belief that he is unhappy by his immaturity, unless some positive pain be superadded."[b]—*Criticism by Dr. Johnson, of Soame Jenyn's Free Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Evil.*

The third supposition, that it is permitted to develop and perfect the sympathetic virtues in us, is the only one of the three first suppositions that we think it necessary to examine.

[b]And in the case of an infant, instead of poverty being necessary to produce a perfect man, it is the one special factor which, if present, is most apt to render all prudence and teachings vain, and pervert the nature of the child.

It is said by those who adopt this idea, in order, in the face of experience and daily observation, to reconcile their conception of God's power with their conception of His mercy, that if there were no poor, there would be no charity; and as the love that produces charity is an angelic attribute, it is well to order affairs so that this attribute may be created and fostered. They argue that if there were no afflicted there would be no benefactors; no sorrow, no pity; no cruelty, no mercy; that, in short, misery and poverty are necessary to produce whatever of good and whatever of nobility, and whatever of tenderness humanity is capable of attaining. There are various objections to this theory. In the first place it is paradoxical. It implies that God has given us the Sisyphean task of removing that which is not permanently to be eliminated, because of the good to be obtained by retaining it. It also includes not only this paradox, but an imputation upon the justice of God. Are the many to be sacrificed for the few? Are the majority to be miserable in order that a few may perhaps be good? Are we of so much importance, that to make us tender-hearted and pitiful, charitable and merciful, a hundred or a thousand poor must present in their sufferings a constant excitant whereby these rudimentary virtues, with which we may have been born, are to be kept alive and developed? Strange conclusions that a ward, a quarter, or a district should suffer for meat and bread, that innocent children should die annually by hundreds and thousands for want of proper nourishment, or for lack of means to secure them the benefit of cleanly homes and pure air, in order that a district visitor may have a chance to organize Dorcas Societies, or to play Lady Bountiful to the masses. And that country gentlemen and merchants, manufacturers and capitalists, may

have an opportunity to enlarge their hearts and develop their sympathetic natures by penny subscriptions and amenabilty to poor-rates. But there is a fundamental and yet more fatal objection to be urged against this idea; charity and love, mercy and justice are not attributes given us to be *excited* into larger growth, by constant irritation; they are faculties that will *grow* with the growth of the man, if the man and the race grow by natural development unperverted and symmetrically. The tear of a child, or the pity of a child, will respond less and less in proportion as its charity or mercy is excited; and, if by the time it has reached the age of forty, it will be strange indeed if less than a hecatomb of victims will arouse its sympathies at all. And if the association with misery is connected with self-interest, the contemplation of a factory full of stinted and pallid children may fail to touch its heart. The result that followed the often repeated sufferings of the gladiators, certainly did not soften the hearts of the Roman people, nor rendered them more susceptible to pity. Says Merivale:

"No true critic of human nature can now fail to trace to their influence the hardness of the heart and conscience of the mass of the Roman people."

And says Montesquieu:

"The constant sight of gladiatorial combats had the effect of rendering the Romans extremely ferocious. It was remarked that Claudius became more inclined to the shedding of blood upon seeing these spectacles."

And he adds "that Claudius was naturally of a mild disposition."—*Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans*, *p.* 294.

This is also the conclusion that De Quincy arrived at—see his Essay on the Cæsars;—and seems to have been the conclusion of Gibbon, for he says:

"If it be true that the sentiment of compassion is imperceptibly weakened by the sight and practice of domestic cruelty," etc.

And every experience justifies their opinions and our conclusions. Do we go for pity and manifestations of a tender heart to our jailers or our police, to those, in a word, who most often have presented to their notice instances of suffering and of poverty? No, to some ingenuous youth, fresh from college or from the simplicities of his country home, some maiden, uncontaminated by conventional opinions, who never saw a case of suffering, or heard a wail of despair; to their uncorrupted and natural hearts we will make our successful appeal.[c]

The only possible cause then, for poverty (ignoring the suppositions that attribute it to God's impotence or decree) is man's ignorance, or, that it is the result of an erroneous system of political economy. That it is not due to man's general ignorance, is proved by the fact that poverty, on a large scale, with demoralizing effect, does not and never has afflicted society until long after very considerable progress in civilization has been made by a nation. Anterior to the time when civilization may be said to have commenced, poverty may have existed from natural conditions of soil, or may have been produced by famines, or wars; but

[c] "But of all the magnificence of the city (of Dublin) there is a sad drawback in the throngs of beggars in rags and filth that one meets at every step, compared to which the wretchedness of other lands is comfort. Miserable women, carrying still more miserable children, and men of strong frames, but gaunt with hunger, in plaintive tones beg charity of you for the love of God. The inhabitants hardened to sights of distress seldom bestow anything upon the sufferers, and it is only the stranger, unaccustomed to such scenes, whose heart melts in compassion."—*Dr. Durbin's Tour in Ireland.*

the poverty that thus ensues early in the life of a nation is followed by *universal* deprivation of the necessities of life; and poverty of this kind can only be sporadic, and except in the cases of a few and comparatively insignificant tribes, is not a permanent source of danger to the nation that may be so afflicted. While the poverty that arises, because of progress, that intensifies as civilization advances; that poverty which is confined to a part of the population, while the remainder grows more and more opulent, this poverty, the result of systems, only troubles society after societies have become old and more or less civilized. Hence, then, we cannot ascribe poverty to the ignorance of man, understanding by ignorance the non-development of the intellectual faculties. The temperance people think that poverty is mainly due to the free use of whisky. But facts and theory declare that intemperance is caused and fostered by poverty; not primarily poverty by intemperance. Of course, after a person becomes addicted to the abuse of liquor, he is apt to be poor, but how many do we see who are very poor and yet are not drunkards? Or how many who drink, more or less, and yet are not poor?

Thompson cuts his throat, and we say truly that Thompson died because he committed suicide.

But we live, and yet we do not owe life to the fact that we have not committed suicide; we live by virtue of other causes, and while our suicide would bring these forces by which we live to an abrupt termination, as long as we do not lay violent hands on ourselves we will long continue to live, and still not owe our life to non-suicide. So with drunkenness. William becomes poor by drink, but if we are not poor it cannot be said that we owe our affluence to abstinence from whisky. The truth of the matter is, that men drink

mostly because of the anxieties of life, if successful in a temporary venture, to celebrate success, if unfortunate, to stimulate against remorse or loss. Hence, drinking becomes customary to those who speculate, and men, if very poor, drink to forget their sorrows, or to enjoy an artificial exhilaration; and also will they drink to excess if, in good circumstances, their duties or circumstances furnish them no vent for their intellectual powers.[d]

Says Bruce of the Shangalla:

"After having been torn from their own country and con-

[d]Thus we understand why more whisky is consumed in the North, as a beverage, than in the South. There are more men very rich who find in life no healthy work, more extreme poverty and more speculation, and because of this last, more and greater changes from affluence to poverty and *vice versa*. "The large consumption of liquor in the South has been taken for granted. The people in that section have been represented chiefly for partisan purposes, a whisky-drinking and intemperate people, and their other sins and weaknesses have been attributed to this one as the chief cause thereof. But, according to the census, the number of retail liquor shops in the North, as compared with the number of inhabitants, is largely in excess of those in the South. In Maine there is one grog-shop to every 791 inhabitants; in Massachusetts, one to every 245; in Connecticut, one to every 235; while in South Carolina there was one only to every 910 inhabitants. There was the same number of liquor shops (7279) in Massachusetts as there were in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Florida combined, and containing a population three times that of Massachusetts. Now either the Southern people have been grossly slandered in regard to their drinking habits, or the suppression of saloons does not suppress the consumption of liquor. If there is more drinking in the Southern States referred to, with only one-third the number of grog-shops that there is in Massachusetts, the suppression of the dram-shops in no way prevents the drinking of liquor. Either the Southern people have had great injustice done them, or the prohibition policy, so far at least as it relates to the closing of grog-shops, is a vain and empty formality."

nections, reduced to the conditions of brutes, to labor for a being they never before knew, after lying, stealing, and all the long list of European crimes have been made, as it were, necessary to them, and the delusion occasioned by drinking spirits is found, however short, to be the only remedy that relieves them from reflecting on their present wretched situation, to which, for that reason, they most naturally attach themselves; then, after we have made them monsters, we describe them as such, forgetful that they are now not as their Maker created them, but such as, by teaching them our vices, we have transformed them into."—*Bruce's Travels, Harper's Family Library.*

And teaching the same lesson of the dependence in great measure of intemperance upon unfortunate circumstances is the following extracts from "The Russian of To-day":

"Once a week a pope, himself an exile, goes down into the mines, (in Siberia) to bear the consolations of religion, under the form of a sermon enjoining patience. By the same occasion he drives a little trade in *vodki*. The miners, who live habitually on *tschi* and black bread, are allowed a koppeck for a good day's work, and this sum invariably goes in drink. Perhaps the raw, rancid spirit serves to keep up their strength, anyhow the intoxication which it brings on affords the unfortunates the only dreg of comfort they can expect on this earth."

Illustrations of the dependence of drink upon frame of mind or upon physical condition, will multiply themselves as we look for them, and we need not linger to enumerate instances.[e]

[e] Writing of the influence of ignorance in producing prostitution, Sanger says: "It is scarcely possible to imagine any thing so likely to lead a woman from the paths of rectitude as ignorance, coupled with the conviction that such ignorance is an insurmountable barrier to her progress in life; *it drives her to intoxication* to drown her reflections, and from intoxication to prostitution the transition is easy and almost certain."—*History of Prostitution*, p. 470. And on page 542 the same writer says: "Our decided

Again, travelers inform us that many of the natives of India are very temperate in this respect, but there are very many poor people in India and other such countries.[f]

So we must look elsewhere for the first cause of poverty.

Mr. Ruskin attributes all the troubles that arise from poverty, and which are becoming so threatening, to the practice of usury[g], and to the introduction and use of ma-

impression is that not one per cent. of the prostitutes in New York, practice their calling without partaking of intoxicating drinks." But it is evident that intoxication is as much the result of some first cause, as that it is often the consequence of prostitution.

[f] "Temperance must be admitted as another virtue of the Italians. Notwithstanding the abundance and the cheapness of wine, intoxication is scarcely known, even among the lower ranks."—*Fisk's Travels in Italy.* And J. R. Green, in his "Studies of Italy," corroborates the above statement: "No civilized country is so degraded as Italy. The country is full of beggars."

[g] On the other hand, according to De Quincy—

"The exquisite silliness of the ancient doctrine—that money doth not breed money—that one gold or silver coin was never known in any natural process of generation to produce another gold or silver coin, gagged the utterance, blindfolded, paralyzed the understanding of man through more than a thousand years."—*The Pagan Oracles.*

We gather from this extract from the writings of this famous Grecian that the practice of usury was unknown in ancient Greece. Did prosperity and happiness follow in consequence to the people of Greece? The historian, Mr. Cox, shall answer our question:

"The chief interest of the life of Solon centres in the social condition of the Athenian people. If Drakon did something to soften the indiscriminate severity of the court of Areopagus, no heed it would seem was taken of the frightful sufferings of the classes who were excluded from all share in the government. But the only point of great importance which we have to determine is the nature of the cause of the intestine disorders prevalent in the country. * * * * * We have before us the fact that the men who exercised power in the State were guilty of gross injustice and of violent robberies among themselves, while of the poor, many were in chains and had been sold away, even into foreign slavery."—*General History of Greece*, pp. 75, 76.

chinery[h]. And by usury he means any interest on moneys loaned. Mr. George, in his work, "Progress and Poverty," has shown that the payment of interest on money borrowed is just and natural. And common sense tells us that a man will not lend money for nothing, when by keeping it he might use it to advantage himself; and besides, we know that the rate of interest in America and in England at least, is lowest where poverty is greatest, and highest where it is less universal.

Suppose all the rich men of Rome, imitating the example of Cato the Elder or Marcus Aurelius, had loaned their money at 4 per cent., does any one suppose that this measure would have prolonged the existence of the Republic or of the Western Empire a single year, or would have appreciably ameliorated the condition of the peasantry of Italy, or the poor of the cities?

Regarding his idea that poverty is caused by the introduction of machinery, factories, founderies, railroads, etc., we have to say, that the introduction and *use* of machinery can only follow upon the *invention* of machinery; and that the invention of machinery is a new and great development of man's intellectual power, and surely intellect in itself, thus manifesting itself, cannot be intrinsically pernicious and "devilish."

Considering the matter in this light, we are lead to

[h]And Burton on the other hand attributed the poverty of the people of England in the seventeenth century to a lack of manufactures; and also, on the contrary side, is J. R. Green, who attributes the amelioration of the condition of the poor to the introduction of machinery: "The extension of industries (the introduction of machinery principally) *at last succeeded in absorbing* this mass of surplus labor, but the process was not complete till the close of Elizabeth's day.—*J. R. Green's History of English People.*

the conclusion that these causes to which Mr. Ruskin attributes poverty are not the necessary prime causes at all. They may be, by unscrupulous management, or as society is at present organized, the necessary cause of much increase of poverty and misery. But this effect should only teach us the necessity of discovering that secret and pernicious sub-cause by which a good thing is thus rendered so potent for evil in the hands of man. And when we reflect further that steam engines and factories, which now occasion so much disquietude and disgust, because of their smoke, rattle and roar, and because of the apparent evil results that sometimes follow from their use, are but in the infancy of their growth, are but in a transitory stage of development, we are justified in believing that ere many years shall pass —in place of the turmoil and din of machinery, as we now know it, a more silent and more effective motor, electricity for instance, will be in successful use, which may admit of our machinery being developed to great and at present undreamed of perfection; and whose powerful influence we, by readjusting our ideas in regard to many things we now consider settled, may make powerful for good on a most magnificent scale, and with most transcendent results. And we know that in order to allow such results to be possible in the future, we must be content with more or less imperfection now, since a beginning has to be made, and we know that this machinery, these obnoxious engines, steam whistles, thundering wheels and all, are in that initiatory stage, for before us the world knew them not. And indeed, in their very newness we see an insuperable objection to their being the cause of poverty. There were no engines in Ireland when Dean Swift wrote, and yet there was much poverty. We are, therefore, constrained to reject Mr. Ruskin's

idea that poverty is because of usury and machinery. But we do not relinquish his explanation of the cause of poverty until we have examined it, and compared it with the ideas of other men equally as pure-minded and disinterested as we believe Mr. Ruskin to be.

Mr. Mallock and the Pope think that poverty and all its attendant evils are due to the spread of Atheism and Infidelity, and to the departure that modern thought is making from the "old faith;" and to the forcible possession taken by all civilized governments of the property of the Church, since, in the good old times, when the Church was paramount, her charity, they say, was sufficient to supply the wants of all who could not or who would not work. For it was *then* that—

"The hand of charity doled out the daily pittance to the destitute, without any offensive inquiry into the cause of a distress, the presence of which was alone a sufficient recommendation for relief."—*Dublin Review.*

M. De Cassagnac, in our opinion, comes nearest to the root of the evil, comes nearer to accounting for the cause of poverty philosophically, and by appeal to history, than any writer we have read, excepting of course the explanation given by those writers whose ideas on the subject are as ours.

And as his explanation will go far to substantiate our opinion in the matter we will transcribe a few passages from his interesting and instructive work; "History of the Working and Burgher Classes," Ben E. Green's translation:

"It was only in proportion to the emancipation of slaves that small proprietors, or working men without capital, or laborers subject to all the chances of sickness, began to exist; and these small proprietors, working men or laborers, at the first serious difficulty, at the first violent crisis, at the first

grievous derangement of health, especially if they had a numerous family to support, found themselves in misery and were reduced to pauperism." *Page* 235.

"We have now the slaves set free; some in the commune as burghers, others, under the feudal system, as peasants. What will they become? Some will labor, economize, amass, and become in the commune the body of artizans and merchants; under the feudal system the class of small proprietors, farmers and day laborers, and others betrayed by physical and moral forces, by sickness, by revolution, by the thousand disappointments which attend man at every turn of his life, will not labor, will not economize, will not amass, and will form the hideous mass of paupers, thieves and prostitutes." *Page* 198.

"The first paupers seen since the formation of great peoples, thus come from the hireling freemen, who having been turned over to themselves, with little property or industry, that is to say, in the language of the economist, with a capital and a credit naturally very inconsiderable, run the risk of spending the one, and losing the other, and of being reduced to beggary for their support." *Page* 153.

But, however much we may admire the learning and applaud the research displayed by M. De Cassagnac in discovering the facts that appear on first sight so strongly to support his theory, or however we may esteem the skill he has displayed in arranging these facts as he has, or however much we may value his disinterestedness of purpose or honor the sincerity of his convictions, we are not prepared to adopt his conclusion that poverty is necessarily the consequence of emancipation.

That this unfortunate result is often a consequence, is too true; but may not this result be due to some more primary, and more obscure cause? The question may arise, why should some be reduced to pauperism because of "betrayal by the physical and moral forces" and others not? To believe

that emancipation was the prime, the neccessary cause of poverty and all its thousand evils, is to give us the option of choosing between two insinuations against the Deity. Is to say, by implication at least, that God either intended slavery to exist perpetually, or that he had intended that poverty, with all its horrid consequences, should for all time be the lot of the majority. And we are not inclined to reduce His power or His mercy to the equivocal position they must present if placed between these alternatives.

And while it is true that emancipation under certain circumstances has often been, and may be, the means of creating paupers, beggars and thieves, is it not probable that these evil results are because of circumstances attending emancipation, and which if different would be followed by the practical good results that reason suggests should follow upon freedom ?

And that these bad results, specified by M. De Cassagnac, are due to other circumstances than the mere fact of emancipation, is rendered probable by the certainty that in many countries, and at various times, emancipation has been productive of the most beneficent results.

Gibbon, writing of the condition of Italy under the reign of Theodoric says:

"In the solitude of Comium, which had been animated by the mild genius of Pliny, a transparent basin about sixty miles in length still reflected the rural seats which encompassed the margin of the Larian lake and the gradual ascent of the hills was covered by a triple plantation of olives, of vines and of chestnut trees. Agriculture revived under the shadow of peace, and the *number of husbandmen was multiplied by the redemption of captives.*" *Vol. III, p.* 369.

And again, in the same volume, page 359, describing the condition of another country he says:

"When time and religion had mitigated the fierce spirit of the Anglo-Saxons, the laws encouraged the frequent practice of manumission; and these subjects of Welsh or Cambrian extraction, assumed the respectable station of inferior freedmen, possessed of lands and entitled to the rights of civil society."

We thus see that emancipation in itself is not a neccessary cause of poverty. What, then, were the different circumstances, the absence or the presence of which could thus make an act, good in itself, injurious or beneficial in its result? We will find the solution of the problem if we follow the remarks Gibbon made when, writing of the state of the country in Saxony, where emancipations, there "frequently repeated," were accompanied with many good results:

"The Saxon kingdom displayed the face of recent discovery and cultivation; the towns were small, the villages were distant, the husbandry was languid and unskillful, four sheep were equivalent to an acre of the best land; an ample space of wood and morass was resigned to the vague dominion of nature, and the modern Bishopric of Durham, the whole territory from the Tyne to the Tees, had returned to the primitive condition of a savage and solitary forest." (p. 357.)

In Britain, then, it appears that there was an abundance of land that the freedmen were at liberty to appropriate, and thus "multiplying the number of husbandmen," contributed to their own comfort and to the welfare of the state. Let us inquire if the emancipations that produce so much misery, so many paupers, as described by M. De Cassagnac, were consummated under conditions the same or different in this respect:

"The country of ancient Italy was inhabited by rich and lordly families, and there were great domains belonging to

the temples, of which the Pagan clergy, as proprietors, superintended the culture and received the revenues."

These great domains, in other words, that belonging to rich and lordly families and the temples, were private property or Church property, from which the emancipated slaves were excluded, or were taxed so heavily as to keep them poor if they worked them. And that these great domains were of such size and so numerous as to exclude the freedmen, many of them at least, as we gather from Merivale, who in his Roman history says:

"By a peculiar and politic provision the citizens of the several (conquered Sicilians) States were forbidden to sell and buy land, one with another. They might only sell; and impoverished as they were by the war, there were, no doubt, plenty of venders to Roman purchasers. Thus a large portion of the soil of Sicily soon passed into the hands of the conquering race. The largest and most fertile islands in the Mediterranean, were thus reduced to dependence with no further cost of men or money." *B. C.* 219–240.

Writing on this same subject—the tendency of the private possession of these large domains to exclude the population from access to land—in another place he says:

"The withdrawal of these hardy races (the Italians and all the nations that could claim any share in the privileges of the Romans) from the labors of the field, to serve in the legions, was of course destructive to the ancient system of agriculture throughout Italy. The transformation of the husbandry of the peninsula from a vast aggregation of small holdings, each worked by its free owner and his family into a handful of large properties tended by slaves under the control of the hired bailiff, was effected, perhaps, in the course of the three generations that reached from the invasion of Pyrrhus to the dislodgement of Hannibal."

We have now disclosed the reason for the different results produced by emancipation in the two countries, Britain and Italy. In one case there was land for the freedmen to occupy, and this land they did occupy with good results to themselves and the country; in the other case the land being in possession of a few rich and lordly families, the freedmen were not allowed to occupy it, and in consequence they congregated in the towns, there to become paupers, thieves, beggars and prostitutes; and thus also necessitated a large number of laws and lawyers to prevent them from doing, or to punish them for doing, those acts which, conflicting with the interests of society, society was obliged to take cognizance of, but which acts these freedmen were obliged to practice in order to sustain life. And the necessities of each class have sharpened the wits of both to such an extent that, in all civilized countries, the so-called departments of law and justice are so complicated and cumbersome that they have become almost self-defeating in their operations. That we have arrived at the first cause of poverty we are the more firmly convinced when we read what M. De Cassagnac himself says in another place in his interesting book in discussing the subject of emancipation in its relation to poverty:

"It was not not from the agricultural slaves, nearly all of whom became small proprietors, that the paupers who are seen in France originally sprang, but from the slaves of the work-shops, the industrial slaves who could not, from the nature of their labor, be comprised in the systems of long leases."

Now, if access to land made of emancipated slaves small proprietors, in some instances, and thus increased the number of good citizens as was the case in Istria, why, we ask again, did not the artisans and others who became paupers

in consequence of emancipation, also become small proprietors? Was it because there was not enough land? What supported them before they were made free? There was, unquestionably, as much land after as before their emancipation.

Yes, but as we have seen it was owned by the rich and lordly families, or the churches or the temples. Placing these two facts together, the solution of the problem is obtained. Private ownership of land is the first cause of poverty. The rich and lordly families employed those slaves whom they did not emancipate in working for them, and the proceeds of the labor of these slaves, over and above what was necessary to feed and clothe them, was spent for their own eating and drinking, which, from all accounts, was very costly and refined; in fine raiments and jewelry, which were beautiful but very expensive; and in keeping up their social or political position in Roman society, which necessitated an expenditure as profuse as it was demoralizing, as extravagant as it was dissolute.

Thus not only the rich and lordly families themselves were enabled to live on what they did not produce, but enabled contractors, speculators, adventurers, pimps and prostitutes also to become rich and lordly in style and expenditures, if they could not confer upon them the advantages to be derived from pedigree or merit. And by their profuse charity, which took the form of largess, or free distributions of corn, oil and wine, they bribed the people in the cities to sustain their wickedness; thus adding by a double wrong to the ever-increasing numbers of the clamorous and hapless poor, and the dissolute and greedy rich, and the free citizens who were fed by their labor, to

the weight of the burden imposed upon the patient, the bewildered and ever-decreasing agricultural laborers. And the pagan clergy, like our own clergy of the middle ages, had doubtless many costly sacrifices to make to God, that necessitated the expenditure of much money—not theirs, and which had to be obtained from labor—of others; had many ceremonies to observe that were very important, holy and awe-inspiring, but very expensive and evanescent.

And doubtless, also, they distributed a great deal of money or food or clothes, which they did nothing to earn, to those who did nothing to deserve them. Nourishing their own pride and idleness, and reputation for holiness at the expense of a few, in order to be considered charitable, while they thus increased the idleness and demoralization of yet many others.[1]

That Mr. Ruskin is well aware of the dependence of poverty or competence upon possession or non-possession of land, is clearly shown, not only by his noble endeavors to obtain land for the poor, and his liberal donations to that end, but because in directing the attention of the English laborers to the results of thrift and labor in Switzerland, and the Tyrol, he has selected a country where every man has a small portion of land. These are his words:

"I can show *you* examples, millions of them, of happy people, made happy by their own industry. *Farm after farm*

[1]Time continually increased, and accidents could seldom deminish the estates of the popular monastaries, which spread over the adjacent country and cities; and, in the first centuries of their institution, the infidel Zosimus has maliciously observed that, for the benefit of the poor, the Christian monks had reduced a great part of mankind to a state of beggary.--*Gibbon*, vol. VI., p. 276.

I can show you in Bavaria, Switzerland, the Tyrol, and other such places."

These people have farms. The English "Workingmen and Laborers," to whom Mr. Ruskin's letters were addressed, have no farms, and there is no remote possibility of their obtaining any, at least not in England; and this fact accounts for the difference between the condition of Switzerland and England. But what strikes us as strange in Mr. Ruskin is, that while aware of the dependence of happiness upon freedom from poverty, to be secured by well regulated, wholesome and remunerative industry, is the manner in which he slurs over the great question of the day, how to get for the use of the "Workingmen and Laborers" of England this land; access to which is so necessary to their physical, intellectual and moral welfare. He makes use of—from respect to him—we will not say such shallow sophistry, but such one-sided and trivial arguments as those which he uses in endeavoring to attract their attention from this vitally important and comprehensive question; he says in "Fors Clavegera:"

"It begins to be asked, on many sides, how the possessors of the land became possessed of it, and why they should still possess more than you or I—" * * * * "The true answer in this matter, as in all others, is the best. Some land has been bought; some won by cultivation; but the greater part in Europe seized originally by force of hand. You may think in that case you will be justified in trying to seize some yourself in the same way. If you could, then you and your children would hold it by the same title as its present holders. If it is a bad one, you had better not so hold it; if it is a good one you had better let the present holders alone."

Now an argument like this is unworthy of Mr. Ruskin.

It is a plain though doubtless an unintentional mis-statement of the merits of the case. Something like this would have been more to the point and more ingenuous:

"It is owned mostly by the descendants of those who seized it by force of arms; now as they had no title whatever to it before, and this seizure does not make a just one, these descendants are willing that this land should be shared alike by all. If we can make you a good title we will do so, it will at any rate be as good or better than the one we now hold by. If we cannot make you a good title we will make you the best we can, but bad or good we will share and share alike, and all, thus, get the benefit of its possession, since benefit we know arises from possession. We have not toiled neither have we spun, yet behold the wealth at our command. And if we by chance have done and do still a little work, it has been work that we had the power to select; we have been able, by the possession of land, to choose the path our infrequent industry did occasionally pursue."

We think we have said enough to show that, as vice and misery in great measure are dependent upon poverty, so too poverty, in its last analysis, is dependent upon non-possession of land—by the many, and that this result will always be the consequence where property in land is recognized as the basis of any country's civilization.

And now we see that poverty is because of an erroneous system of political economy, which, assuming the right of individuals to own lands, has resulted in producing an amount of misery and woe only to be equaled by the results achieved by the Church, which also assuming false premises has built up a theological system that has caused untold agony and sorrow to millions.

In both cases we have been endeavoring to make a pyramid stand on its apex—and civilization and law, religion and

progress, in the main, may be likened to the props and scaffolding we have reared in our effort to produce this result. Let the pyramid stand on its base and we may increase it to an extent that, in its reverse condition, was not deemed posssible, and we can dispense, too, with the artificial bolsters, props and safe-guards society has expended so much time in devising.

CHAPTER XI.

THE CAUSE OF POVERTY—Continued.

"No one can be a great thinker who does not recognize that, as a thinker, it is his first duty to follow his intellect to whatever conclusions it may lead."—*John Stuart Mill.*

"That which is not good for the hive neither is it good for the bee."—*Marcus Aurelius.*

In order to prove the conclusion arrived at inductively in the last chapter, that the cause of poverty is private ownership of land, we will devote this chapter to the attempt to arrive at the same conclusion by deduction.

In the first place, in order to relieve the subject under consideration, of all that may be calculated to shroud it from our clear comprehension, let us suppose that our world, instead of containing billions of acres of land, and hundreds of millions of people, divided into races, nations and tribes, scattered over continents and islands, is comprised in one grand field of a thousand acres, and that its inhabitants, numbering one hundred adults, are, for all practical purposes, equally free, industrious and educated. In this suppositional case, it is evident that if each one of these inhabitants owns ten acres of our little world, the amount of wealth in the form of houses, cattle and provisions, etc., that each may possess, will be proportionate to the equal fertility of the soil, to the labor each will exert in cultivating his land, in building his houses, in raising his cattle, and on the amount of economy which each will practice in taking

care of those goods, and that produce, which his labor and his attention shall have created.

This is the simplest presentation of the relation that labor and economy bear to wealth, and that they both bear to land; and any system of political economy that may be presented to us, will be correct in principle in proportion as it shall be based upon, and shall have a tendency to maintain, these relations. Here, then, in our little world, its inhabitants in conditions equal and simple, we have the true source of legitimate wealth—land, labor and economy.

And if, in course of time, one man should choose to make clothing for the rest, he would have as much right to expect that labor, skill and economy in his new pursuit would secure him the same comforts in life that the rest of the inhabitants obtained by an equal attention to agriculture, if they availed themselves of the produce of his skill, labor and time; and so, too, with the man who should elect to make shoes, so with him who should undertake the care of the health of the rest, and for that purpose should devote his time and intelligence to the study and the practice of medicine. That system of differentiation of labor, then, which commences so early in the history of all civilized communities must, to be legitimate, be based upon the demands of the rest of the people, and upon the choice of the person who thus leaves the body of the agriculturist to attain, by more congenial or more easily accomplished work, the competency that he might have secured had he chosen to have remained a farmer. If there should be too few of these artisans to supply the demands that may be made upon them by the mass of the people, the price that may be placed by each artisan on the products of his skill and labor, may be so high as to more quickly make him a for-

tune than he would have been able to have attained in the same time tilling the soil. But, in this event, other artisans will arise and competition will regulate profit, but as long as land is free, competition cannot cut prices below a certain point of fair margins. (See chapter xiii.)

For whenever the tendency is to lower wages for skill or for labor, below the margins the same labor or skill could obtain by reverting to agriculture, then so many will become farmers as to keep the margin about on a par with the profits they make as tillers of the soil. The price of labor, then, of all kinds, to be legitimate, must be based upon the demand for a labor which has access to free land; and competition can only be desirable to prevent prices being kept too high. Competition that will force wages below an agricultural margin of profits is not desirable; but this, competition will eventually do if land is not free.

Now, in a condition of society as simply organized as in the case we have postulated, it is obvious that the civilization and the happiness of the whole community will progress equally and favorably in proportion as their political power is equal, and is exercised by delegates elected by the majority, or shall be conferred by the majority upon the one or more who are deemed fittest to exercise it for the good of all.[a] And as the increase of education, which being based upon observation and facts, and limited only by individual capacity, shall have a constant tendency to produce an equalization of all above the level of natural ignorance in which each is born towards the standard exceptional circumstances or character may have developed, and as their system of political economy shall allow a like equalization of all above

[a] If a perfect man could be found who would live forever, then a despotism would be the better form of government.

the level of poverty in which all entered the world. And as these three factors in promoting civilization shall be equal in development and progressive in their tendency. The only circumstance that could render this primitive society an unequal one, that is, with any color of right or justice, would be for a part to claim dominion over the rest by virtue of some right obtained outside of the people; or by part claiming to be messengers of God, ordained to teach morality and religion to the others; and they, forcing by fear or fraud their crude assumptions and deductions upon the people, thus intersecting, perhaps at right angles, the conclusions a just induction would, as knowledge increased, have suggested, attempt to anticipate with the knowledge of the first the knowledge of the twentieth century. And which ministers, by attempting to stay "the unlawful wanderings of the human mind," should seek "to stifle schism in its birth," and who, by endeavoring "to *reduce* the loftiest spirits as well as meanest understanding, to a just obedience," (*St. Louis Cabinet*) should attempt an artificial equality impossible in speculative subjects to attain. And if in either case, in politics or religion, the claims of these aspirants should be made good by virtue of superior enthusiasm, superior force, or superior natural capacity, while the majority, by force of an innate desire for good, should prove easy victims to those who professed to be able to teach them the way to God, or who are rendered incapable by deficient education of disproving the assertions of priests and preachers, or, by physical inferiority, unable to withstand the ambition of those who sought political or spiritual power by force, or claimed it as a right, it is apparent that the disturbing elements thus introduced will be pernicious in effect in proportion as the power or the privileges thus obtained will be ex-

ercised in a manner calculated to destroy the equality, limited only by individual capacity and application, which had heretofore prevailed. And in proportion as these kings or priests shall make their own aggrandizements and comfort, or the power and importance of their order, their principal consideration. And shall by the institution of ceremonials and observances, flattering to their superstition, or agreeable to their pride, and at the same time calculated to create a spirit of dependence and credulity among the body of the people, will their influence be pernicious. And it will matter not how these orders were established, whether by violence or fraud, by honest conviction on their own part, or by the entreaty or with the ready acquiescence of the people, the result will be the same, the effect will be as equally pernicious. A cannon will make as much mischief if fired accidentally by a maiden, as if fired with a purpose by a pirate, if the line of direction and the force evolved are the same.

And in proportion as this right to spiritual or political dominion shall be unchallenged, and their offices or persons highly esteemed, will their power grow, and their wealth; for those contributions, in money or in kind, which at first may have been free offerings from the people, produced by reverence or by gratitude for supposed blessings, will, in course of time, be obligations imposed upon them in the form of tithes or taxes, whose collection will be enforced by law, or by appeals to their credulity and their interest, or by threatenings directed to their fears, and will not remain dependent upon the uncertain duration or extent of spontaneous gratitude.[b] And if the parties or per-

[b] "The laws of Charlemagne enforced the imposition of tithes, because the dœmons had proclaimed in the air that the default of payment had been the cause of the last scarcity."—*Gibbon, Vol. IV., p.* 289.

sons in whom the spiritual or political power is vested are at variance, the competition which will ensue between them will take the form of extravagance and display, or in struggles by war or intrigue, for supremacy in the State, the means to sustain which will require money, that can come but from one source—the labor of the people.

And this state of affairs will continue, and will grow more and more complicated and oppressive, until the practice of the spiritual or temporal powers will become so self-evidently pernicious in their effects, and they themselves so intolerably corrupt in their habits, that some will be found among the people or among the conscientious of either order, to expose their wickedness, and perhaps challenge their authority. And these will at once be termed rebels or infidels, socialists or atheists, according as they shall attack the one institution or the other; and, if perchance, they question the authority of both, "reckless subverters of time-honored and existing forms of government, and atrocious maligners of religion, revealed by God and rendered venerable by age," will be the mildest of the epithets they will be called upon to endure.

But thus only is it possible to inaugurate revolutions in governments, and reformations in religions.

And the difficulty of accomplishing either will be great in proportion as the eyes of the people shall be kept from investigating the correctness or incorrectness of the *premises* upon which political or religious power has been founded. For their innate inclination to be law-abiding, and tendency to be religious, will make them adhere to almost any form of either that they may have been educated under.

But having been based in both cases upon false premises, the superstructures that will have been erected by the in-

genuity or the ignorance of man, or imposed by the necessities of circumstances, will finally become so great and complicated, and subversive of happiness, that reformation will necessarily be forced upon the people.

And all progress and reform thus rendered possible by inquiry, discussion and negation, in either politics or religion, will be happy in their results in proportion as the customs and practices which have grown up and taken form under the old regime shall be modified or eliminated; and as the government or religion thus reformed—(unformed)—shall have a tendency to restore the primitive order and relations of society—*not*, be it understood, *the primitive condition, but the primitive relations.*

If now, while the struggle between superstition and education, between kings and people, shall be progressing, it should happen that our little world be invaded by outsiders (from the moon or any other where,) who should appropriate the land to themsives, or if it should happen that in unforming the politics or the theological theories of the country, that property in land which priest and noble had obtained in their days of power, by speculation, fraud, spoliation or bequest, should, through ignorance of ultimate results that would follow, or from conscientious scruples regarding the abstract principles of property, be respected, and that land should remain in their possession,[c] it will be a matter of only a short time before another element

[c] "From the moment when Wyclif stood in Lambert Chapel, the Church sunk, ecclesiastically as well as politically, into non-existence. It survived merely as a vast land owner."—*Lambert and the Archbishop. John Richard Green.* "Whatever other aspects the reformation may present, it gave, at any rate, emancipation to the one class of English to whom freedom had been denied, the towns that lay in the dead hand of the Church."—*Abbot and Town. John Richard Green.*

of confusion and unhappiness will enter into our miniature world. For while the struggle for civil and religious liberty shall have been going on, the population will have increased very materially, and the children of the people will have to apply to the ex-nobles and ex-priests, or to their descendents, for land upon which, by their labor, to make a living. And the rent and price of this land will constantly increase in value with the ever-increasing number of applicants for its use. And *this* system will continue until the continual absorption of the produce of labor by the land owners will result in a wealthy land-holding aristocracy, a constantly diminishing and struggling middle class, and a mass of ill-paid laborers, thieves, rogues and prostitutes.[d]

And when a bad season comes through the failure of crops, floods or other disasters, the possible savings from the previous labor of thousands will be insufficient to provide against the calamities caused by these occasional catastrophes.

And then will those arise who, judging from results, will begin to examine the correctness of the current theories of political economy, as in the past, others, *judging also from results*, had set themselves to examine the current theories upon which government and religion had been based. And unless this is done in politico-economical matters, and like change is not made in this department, the misery that will follow upon a system of political economy, based upon the premise that the "price of labor depends upon the income of the land-owners," arising from the rent of land, like

[d]That France did not touch upon the rights of property in land during her great revolution, is a sufficient explanation of the failure of the revolutionists to accomplish all the good they had in their power to obtain, and also accounts for the troubles that have since that time afflicted the Republic.

the vices and unhappiness arising from religion based on a wrong premise, and politics based upon a wrong foundation, will necessitate a mass of legislation, expedients and make-shifts that they will be as impotent to rectify as they are calculated, by complication and number, to hide from view the primary evil.[e]

And by this accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few, extravagances will be multiplied among the rich, and arrogance, debauchery and licentiousness (tempered only by education, and this only with some,) will become common; and servility, mendacity, robbery and prostitution will become equally common with the poor. With the further evil result, that the middle class, being urged by the glitter and the glamour that surround the wealthy, will exert all possible means to increase their own incomes, to enable them to enter the enchanted circle of the successful few. And the fear of becoming as miserable as the poor if they fail, will sharpen their mercenary wits, harden their calculating hearts, and will make them reckless and unscrupulous as speculators or competitors, merciless and indifferent as masters or employers. And unless a radical remedy is applied, with every year the process of the demoralization of society will continue, in spite of laws, theological and political, which, by attempting to correct and repress will, in fact, greatly increase the sociological complications and the evils of the times. And mankind will at length awake to a despairing consciousness of the

[e] "Most of the crimes which disturb the internal peace of society are produced by the restraints which the necessary but unequal laws of property have imposed on the appetites of mankind by confining to a few the possession of those objects that are coveted by many."—*Gibbon, Vol.* I, *page* 136.

wickedness that has taken possession of the world; and many will conclude that all the progress made in liberty and in government, in the acquisition of knowledge, in the refinement of art, and in the development of science, will have been in vain.

And, indeed, many will lay to the charge of invention, democracy, or education, all these woes; and men who had fondly dreamed that such a condition as happiness and virthe might be realized upon this earth, will lose their hold on hope and begin to believe in the verity and necessity of the old time dogmas, which declare that man is by nature wicked and necessarly corrupt, that death is the penalty of sin, and that humanity needs some supernatural means to regenerate and ennoble it.

Then will the heirs of the spirit of the clerical and political teachers of the past laugh at our progress and mock at our civilization, and will recommend a quick return to the "simplicity of the past and the faith of our fathers." Thinking that that condition, which owed all that it possessed of good to the fact that land was in excess of laborers, and because small tenants were plentiful, was due to the absence of other and sometimes sinister appearing causes, which were then unknown, but which are now so conspicuously prominent in modern civilization. For in all instances of national European development heretofóre observed, while advance has been made in education and in government, they have neglected, and, indeed, have originated and nourished the cause of their final overthrow in the past, and the cause of vice and misery and ever increasing degeneration in the present—private property in land.

It was this cause that produced the decay and the destruction of Rome, and hastened the overthrow of Greece;

it is this cause that has rendered Ireland monumental by her miseries; it is this cause that is now rapidly undermining England and has produced untold suffering to every nation whom she has controlled; and from the existence of the same cause we of the United States of America are experiencing all our financial and political troubles and moral deterioration.

And now that we have proved our proposition we may consider it established that the miseries and vices of modern civilization arise mostly from poverty, or from the fear of poverty, and that poverty in Europe and America is the ultimate, necessary result of making land an object of private property.

It is possible, however, that many will not agree to our conclusions, since, they may say, in reaching these conclusions, we have not taken into consideration a prominent factor of modern civilization that was absent or but little developed in the civilization of antiquity.

It may be said that the Romans did not carry on manufacturing industries as England does, as minute in particulars, nor on so grand a scale, and hence the idle and poverty-stricken population that contributed so much to the demoralization of Roman morals and to the destruction of the Roman Empire.

Alluding to this matter of factories, Burton, writing in the 17th century, attributed to *the want of factories* the miseries and the vices of the populace of England whose condition even at that time, in both respects, had assumed very alarming proportions. He says:

"That in spite of many particular blessings, which our neighbors want, the gospel truly preached, church discipline established, etc." * * * in spite of a learned religious

king; another Numa, a second Augustus, a true Josiah, Most Worthy Senators, and a learned clergy, an obedient commonalty, etc." * * * there existeth idleness, by reason of which we have many swarms of rogues and beggars, thieves, drunkards and discontented persons, * * * many poor people in all our towns." (*Anatomy of Melancholy—p.* 56.)

Yet since the time of Burton, England has had more and greater manufacturing industries than any two of the countries whose superiority in the 17th century, in that respect, excited Burton's patriotic envy. But how much better now is the condition of England's poor? By how much diminished her rogues and vagabonds? In London alone there are over 70,000 people who live by their wits, by illegal skill, force, or fraud. And in the manufacturing districts of England two-thirds to three-fourths, or even as much as five-sixths, of the infants die annually of neglect, or want, or because of other evils incidental to poverty. "On this last point," says the *Contemporary Review*, "all the official reports concur so unanimously that they may well be described as damnable iterations." [f] And concerning the present condition of the poor in England, the following extract from an American's visit to London will give an idea of the destitution that prevails in the 19th century in that city:

"This, be it understood, was a penny lodging-house, where the most miserable of the race were accustomed to resort when their funds ran low. Proceeding up the stairs, the policeman said to me, 'Be careful, to walk in the middle of the stairs, for the sides are all covered with night-soil.'

[f] Mr. Russell Wallace even estimates those who are more or less dependent on charity at 4,500,000, out of our total population of 28,000,000.—*The coming Revolution in England. H. M. Hyndman, in North American Review. for October*, 1882.

He also told me not to touch any thing in the house, and that I had better slip my pantaloons inside my boots, for fear of the body-lice which abounded there. Ascending two pairs of stairs, we entered a room about sixteen feet square; in one corner, on a pile of rags laid upon the floor, were a man and three boys. The man had a shirt on, but the boys were perfectly naked. Across the foot of the bed lay a girl of fourteen or fifteen, with absolutely nothing on her person but an old bonnet over her hair, apparently to keep it from becoming tangled. The boys, who were the ones we had just before seen stealing into the house, pretended to be in a sound sleep, and rubbed their eyes very naturally. They protested vehemently they had stolen nothing all day, and appealed to the woman whether they had not been unable to pay for their lodgings, as a triumphant proof of their innocence. In the next corner was a man between two women, the face of one of whom was a complete mass of blood. In the other two corners of the room were similar collections of rags, similarly occupied. There was neither a bedstead nor a bed in the room. The plastering had been torn away by yards, and the rotten floor was inclined at a considerable angle from a level, and seemed as though it would give way at every step. We went into a number of other rooms, filled with the same miserable occupants, but a hasty glance sufficed. Of such wretchedness I had never conceived, and all this, and much more, existed within ten minute's walk of the palace where the Queen was then sleeping, and of the residences of the aristocracy, the humanity, and the wealth of the land."

The truth of the matter is, that beyond a certain limit, manufactures cannot be carried on profitably in England or anywhere else. And it is notorious that the poor increase much faster in population than the rich, thus increasing the competition for work that is to be done, which seems to array God himself against these unfortunates; and mechanics and science are also on the side of the capitalist, and

every year witnesses some improvement in machinery, or some more economical processes, rendering capital more and more independent of labor. Therefore, in any country where a few monopolize the soil, and where an increasing capital is required to successfully carry on manufacturing on a scale that will pay, or that can even live under the fire of modern competition, the time will come, sooner or later, when the competition will be with the masses as to *whom* they may *work for*, the manufacturer or the landlord.

A poor man may possibly have his choice of the two but hardly this if he is a married man and is held by his affection, or duties in one particular district. But his class daily increasing, his wages will be fixed by the necessities of the more straitened of the able bodied in the community. Trades-unions, and superior skill, and statute enactments, may check, temporarily and at times, the tendency of wages to a point of bare subsistence. But to this point is the tendency, and in many vocations it will reach that point, indeed has, in several classes of work, already reached it.

Mr. Green says that a stevedore can, by rigid economy, may hope to save twenty pounds by five year's labor. Suppose that under the conditions the stevedore has daily to live, he can so keep up heart as not to want an occasional glass of beer, (and two or three a day will exhaust his prospective twenty pounds,) and conceding that he can be so philosophic as to abstain from the humble comfort to be obtained from a pipe or a dram, when he has saved his twenty pounds, what then? He cannot go into business on that amount of capital; he cannot buy five acres of good land for it in England. Shall he put it in bank and gain at the end of another five years three pounds in interest, or possibly

lose it all by some "respectable gentleman's failure," or embezzlement? Shall he emigrate? If he has a family, ten years work will hardly pay their expenses for passage to America or Australia, and furnish them with transportation to where cheap lands can be obtained, and support himself and family *en route*, and procure farming utensils and provisions until a crop can be made.

It is a wonder to us that under such circumstances, for such a reward, men work at all.

Manufactures can put off the evil day for awhile, but as long as the law recognizes the right of individuals to own land that evil day must inevitably come. Scotland furnishes another illustration to the point:

"During the 17th century the only Scotch manufacture of any importance," says Buckle, "was that of linen, which, however, like every other branch of industry was very backward, and was exposed to all sorts of discouragements. But after the union it received a sudden impetus from two causes, one of these causes, as I have already noticed, was the demand from America, consequent upon the trade of the Atlantic being thrown open. The other cause was the removal of the duty which England had imposed upon the importation of Scotch linen. These two circumstances, occurring nearly at the same time, produced such an effect on the national industry that De Foe, who had a wider knowledge of the detail of trade than any man of that age, said, 'that it seemed as if, for the future, the Scotch poor could never lack employment.'" Continues Buckle, "unfortunately this was not the case, and never will be, until society is *radically changed*." (Italics ours.)

And what the condition of those poor became who could succeed in obtaining employment in Scotland, may be inferred when we are told,

"That when one of the anti-slavery agitators, (Col. J. S. Col-

lins), on a visit to England, (1860-61,) addressed a large audience in a Scottish manufacturing town, and wound up as he had been used to in the United States, by giving the rations which the slave Codes of some of the States fixed as a minimum of maintenance for a slave, he quickly discovered that to many of his hearers it was an anti-climax."—*Progress and Poverty, p.* 319.

Or to refer again to England, whose prominence as a center of manufacturing industries, and whose condition of chronic embarrassment because of her numerous and constantly increasing poor, makes her fittest to serve as an illustration of the impotence of manufactories to prevent pauperism,—that she, by her manufactories has been able to provide for her poor better and for a much longer time than she would have been able to have done without them, is indisputable. But she owes this result to the fact that for many years she has virtually monopolized the principal manufacturing industries of the world, and her population had a world to exercise their exertions and support their existence. But whenever other countries shall begin their own manufacturing on a scale at all commensurate with their importance and their necessities, as many nations are now beginning to do, England will reap the full benefit of her injustice to her native poor, in debarring them from the free use of land, and of that visionary and short-sighted policy which, ignoring the fundamental error of a system of political economy founded upon the preposterous idea that "the income of the gentlemen of England constitutes the wage fund of labor," hoped and taught that by manufactories she could always find remunerative fields for the labor of the people of England. From this cause trouble is now already upon her, and unless she can find some undiscovered and extensive industry to engage their attention, and by further stimulating the hopes of the poor, thus

postpone yet awhile the day of reckoning, it will be only a short time before England must either throw open her lands to the people of England, or follow in the paths of other nations who have been as great as she, and, from the same cause that brought about their destruction, add her own name to the galaxy of faded empires.

But it may be again objected, that admitting the impotence of factories to prevent the monopolization of land producing its ultimate results, that the parallel we have sought to establish is not complete, and that therefore the conclusions arrived at are fallacious. The thousand acres of our imaginary field do not constitute the world; neither are one hundred souls the number of its inhabitants. This is very true, but in stating this fact as a reason for objecting to the conclusions reached, we have removed the prop—the only prop—which the economists have relied on to support their present system. The only ground upon which it has been attempted to sustain, by argument, the system necessitated by the supposed pressure of subsistence upon population, or served as an excuse, with any decent regard to the rights of man, to maintain it since the time of Malthus.

This writer, in his work on the *Principles of Population*, maintained, and was considered to have proved, that poverty was a necessity of existence to the great majority. He took the position, which he endeavored to hold by reference to facts, that poverty arose from pressure of population upon the means of subsistence, was, in a word, a decree of nature and unavoidable. And as his position was calmly taken and philosophically argued, and as his conclusions coincided with the interest of those whose professions, work or birth, entitled them, in their estimation, to claim as a right, or as a reward of superiority, what man has never hesitated to take by force—pre-eminence and wealth, the idea was univer-

sally seized upon and has ever since been urged as being the basis upon which God had determined to erect society. And as this conclusion was apparently warranted by a large array of facts, some of the wisest and most disinterested men, such as Adam Smith and Buckle, have accepted it as the basis of their sociological reasoning; and the wisdom of modern philosophers and liberal Christians has been able to discern in this "providential arrangement" the basis and the proof of the modern, preposterous idea of the survival of the fittest.

Now if the world were composed only of a thousand acres of land, it is evident that the position of those who claim that poverty, to the many, is an unavoidable necessity, owing to the constant increase of population, is a correct one. But it has been shown by Mr. Henry George, in his admirable work, *Progress and Poverty*, that the premise assumed is erroneous; and it follows that if Malthus was wrong in his premises, all his conclusions are certainly open to dispute. Those who care to investigate the matter further are invited to see the facts that Mr. George has arrayed against Mr. Malthus on this subject. We will only say here that after giving some time and attention to the investigation of Mr. Malthus' premises, that we heartily and entirely agree with Mr. George that the "pressure of subsistence" theory has no reason in fact for its position as a fundamental factor in modern political economy. The reader is also referred to the instructive remarks that occur in Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy (pp. 58–59),[8] and to the very interesting essay

[8] "Many will not believe but that our Island of Great Britain is now more populous than ever it was, yet let them read Bede, Leland and others, and they shall find it most flourishing in its Saxon Heptarchy and in the conqueror's time was far better inhabited than at the present (17 Cent.)—*Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy*, p. 58.

on this subject, by Mr. Gregg, entitled, "Malthus Notwithstanding," contained in his work, *Enigmas of Life.*

We will content ourselves with these references and a few foot-notes, and continue our argument as though the point was conceded.[h]

And not only are we warranted by Mr. George's facts to conclude that there is land enough in the world to afford a comfortable sustenance to all its inhabitants, but, presupposing a God, we would deductively arrive at this conclusion

[h] "To such an extent has the population of Egypt diminished that it now scarcely amounts to two millions; but this decrease is not peculiar to Egypt; and other countries once more remarkable for their populousness have undergone a similar change; while others then scantily peopled now teem with inhabitants.

Indeed, the question suggests itself, whether the world, within historic times at least, has not always had the same amount of population as at the present day. Whatever increase has taken place in some parts of the globe, the total will not surpass that of olden times; and when we compare the populous condition of Assyria and the neighboring countries, Persia, India, Asia Minor, Syria and Scythia, which till Tartar times spread their hordes over distant countries, we are led to the conviction that the inhabitants of the small continent of Europe, and the rising population of America do not exceed the number that crowded the ancient world. This, however, is only a question (I offer with great diffidence) to those who are competent to decide it."—*Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, Vol. I. p.* 305.*

*Says a traveler (*Henry Howe's Celebrated Travelers*): "Siberia is noted for its mineral wealth; gold, silver, platina, copper and iron being of late years produced in enormous quantities. The grand mining districts are on its eastern border in the Ural Mountains; the principal gold mines are those of Berrosoo. Through its enormous wealth Siberia may eventually become one of the most powerful and wealthy nations in the world.

"The climate, except the excessive cold, is on the whole favorable to man. And this country, though comprising fully one-eighth of the area

also. For it is preposterous to suppose that He would create a world inadequate to maintain those whom he knew would inhabit it. A just and tender Father would not so serve his children; and, surely our God is wise, and just, and merciful.

We have now furnished our proof that private ownership of land is the cause of poverty, and if this is true, we can see of what little avail progress in education or good government can be, if like progress is not made in attaining a competency. These three factors must develop together for good results to follow. And we also see that as the religious instinct began to incorporate itself into forms and

of the known world, is so thinly settled as to possess a population of less than four millions, or about one person to every square mile.

"The country is well watered by numerous great rivers, which unitedly form many thousand miles of internal navigation."

And says Captain Burnaby in his *Ride to Khiva*, p. 495, Lakeside Library Edition: "We were now approaching Jana Darga, the dried up bed of a river which is lost in the sand. All the desert in this neighborhood was once thickly inhabited. Canals cut on all sides irrigated the now parched up soil; and this was not so long ago, for there are men alive who say that they have heard tell of the former richness of this district."

"As we go north the hills become higher, and the rainfall being more regular and more ample, cultivation is very general, even where irrigation is impossible. We are never long out of sight of fields, either newly plowed or covered with corn already nearly ripe for the sickle. The thousands of acres of barley, already almost in the ear, which one sees while riding along, makes one doubt Malthus' theory, that population increases faster than food can be found for it. The population is very sparse, and yet grain and sheep abound in this region. The population, such as it is, has a well-fed look and both men and women are comfortably clad. Clothing is more substantial and more ample than amongst the fallaheen of the warmer country about Bagdad and south of that city. The climate is healthy and during the greater part of the year is as cool and bracing as any in the world.—*Through Asiatic Turkey, p.* 43, *Grattan Geary, Seaside Library Edition.*

ceremonies, it became distorted, and pernicious in its effects, because of having been founded upon wrong premises,—and that, as theology was but the varying efforts of various men to reconcile what they *felt* was God's will with those premises, it has resulted in a mass of complications and contradictions that has made theology dark, gloomy and cruel. That, as the civil law was founded, in the main, for the protection of landlords, and consequently upon an erroneous theory of the rights of some to possession of land, the efforts that ever since have been made to extract justice from law, have been the result of man's innate idea of justice, endeavoring to assert itself, but which has become so warped and distorted by contact with enactments and precedents, so confused and confusing in its endeavor to show that justice is compatible with premises considered unquestionably sound, as to have resulted in the mass of complicated and cumbersome paraphernalia of our modern courts. Have indeed, become so cumbersome and complicated that these courts have to confine themselves entirely to facts, ignoring abstractions entirely. The man who has merely the *right* on his side, has as much chance of having justice done him in the higher English and American courts, against an adversary with no *right*, but with law and precedent in his favor, as theology considers his chance of reaching heaven without its passport and benediction. In neither case are abstractions considered; in both cases the reply to the purest minded client or "seeker" is: "It is written, unless you have the facts to show—you will be non-suited; unless you be baptized you cannot be saved."

So too, political economy being founded upon an erroneous premise, in its efforts to erect itself into a practical, working system, conducing to the benefit and progress of

man, has refined itself into a series of theories that are almost incomprehensible, and because of its baneful results to society has been termed, all too aptly, "the dismal science."

And, as in the two professions already mentioned, intentions count for nothing, if *forms* are not complied with, so too with the "*science*" of political economy; one may *will* to work, may *want* to work, may pray for work, but unless he can find, outside of himself, some exceptional demand for his labor, he must content himself with furnishing a maximum of labor for a minimum of reward; must, in a word, "struggle for existence."

And for what are millions of human beings thus sacrificed? Is it in order that a few may become supremely happy? Alas! No. Even the consolation that might be derived from a successful sacrifice is denied the helpless victims. Their efforts, put forth with pain, with many a heart burst, with many a maddening brain, with many sighs of desolation, and with tears of despair, according to the most uncompromising advocate of the system maintained at such a cost —ultimately ends in additional sorrow and unhappiness.

"Inequality as it increases, will in every case increase production, until by its magnitude it begins to cause despair or indifference, rather than hope in the skilled laborer; and misery and weakness instead of resolve in the unskilled. * * * And that however in many cases, happiness may be increased by an increase of riches, it does not *necessarily bear any* proportion to them."[1]

In short, Mr. Mallock states that even the wealth that has been the result, for the most part, of the successful operation of a system that "causes despair and indifference rather than hope; misery and weakness instead of resolve"

[1] *W. H. Mallock's Social Equality, pp.* 196--200.

to those who produce it, does not necessarily bear any proportion to the happiness or unhappiness of those who receive its benefits.

Surely inconsistency could go no further, than, in the face of such facts, to still insist upon the continuation of the self-same system. But Mr. Mallock can; and he has gone further, and ventures to counsel this continuance, because

"It is never wise to yield to hope too easily, but were the modern theory of equality once abandoned and discredited, there are abundant reasons, I believe, for a sober assurance that the cause of the poor and suffering would receive almost instantly an incalculable accession of strength."[j]

Now we have the whole ground for his advice to the miserable and despairing poor to cease their efforts to inaugurate another system of political economy in place of that now existing, which increases in producing "misery" and "despair" in proportion as it is adhered to. And that ground is, because he, Mr. Mallock, indulges a *hope* that if they do, the rich, the wealthy, will condescend to look into the matter and may possibly array themselves upon their side.[k]

Range through all the annals of English history, and show us one solitary example of the rich, as a class, doing

[j] Idem, p. 212.

[k] "Yet Mr. Mallock is consistent. The same method of reasoning that in theological matters impels him to advise his readers to remain true to the "old faith," in spite of the grievous results that have followed such adherence in the past; "to believe, though they cannot comprehend,* *simply because of hope for the future*; induces him in politico-economical matters to give the same advice to still persist in adhering to the old methods, in spite of the universal evil that he admits results in the present to both rich and poor, simply because he has a hope that by so doing, in some mysterious way, from some unknown cause, good may result because of such persistence."

*Is Life Worth Living?

any thing for the poor but grinding every ounce of labor from them for the least possible pay; show us any thing else but evictions; but the pillory and the jail; but transportations and the gibbet, and we will admit that Mr. Mallock's "hope" may have some basis to rest upon; but until this can be done, he must not complain if the "Democrats," though they represent a force and a cause "*that constitutes them the most formidable danger that ever threatened society*," decline to accept this hope, "sober" as it may be, as a reason to desist from their efforts to obtain something of justice, and to add something of happiness to the world.

That in its final analysis, wealth is produced by labor applied to land, no one will deny; that additional value may be given by art, or science, or by capital, neither will any one gainsay; but in the final examination it must be conceded that wealth is the product of labor. And this being admitted, it is obvious that if the land is owned by a comparatively few, with all the right that ownership gives, poverty must be the consequence, sooner or later, to the great majority who do not own land. And if poverty, then meanness, thievery, robbery, murder, prostitution and all manner of wickedness, the inevitable consequences of poverty, are sure to follow. History tells us what Roman civilization became in consequence, mainly, if not entirely, of the extreme wealth of the idle few and the extreme poverty of the idle and industrious poor, which characterized the later days of the Republic; and we have seen that as early as 133 B. C., the cause was known, and attempts were repeatedly made to remove it. History also tells us the consequence that followed the failure.

Having thus proved the proposition that poverty is dependent upon private ownership of land, it only remains to inquire of what practical use to man is this knowledge.

Its practical utility consists in this, that it allows us to read with greater understanding the history of the world; it will enable us to correct that monstrous canker, poverty, which in spite of good government, in spite of education, in spite of man's natural inclination to be just, good and generous, has flourished most when its presence was, without this knowledge, most inexplicable; and has, time and time again, defeated or postponed the design of God, which only requires that all three of these baneful diseases be absent from the constitution of society to enable Him to stand revealed in His glorious purposes to the naturally developed religious sense of man.

With this key in our possession we can understand how it was that the world has been startled often by the birth of nations who because of their freedom from crime and unhappiness, and by the observance of justice and practice of virtue, have each had their golden age, which ignorantly, we term their mythological era.[e] And by reason of this condition have obtained an eminence whose ultimate height of possible attainment we may best infer, from the obscurity

[e] "We know for instance (so far as we can speak of knowledge of the general character of an epoch,) that the early Commonwealth of Rome was distinguished by remarkable purity of manners, that the marital tie was singularly respected, that the Latin yoemen who were the backbone of the community, were industrious and laborious, that they lived with frugality and simplicity and brought up their children in the humble fear of God, or of the gods or rulers to whom they would have to give an account." The deduction arrived at in the text, then, accounts for this condition of affairs, and also demonstrates the error so generally prevalent: that virtue is supposed to have flourished so long as liberty survived and (that) the perfidy and profligacy, of which we read with disgust in Tacitus and Juvenal, are regarded as the necessary offspring of despotism." —*Last Days of the Roman Republic, James A. Froude, p.* 187. "In its early

from which, in so short a time, they often emerge; and the excessive vitality some of them have preserved in spite of the constant operation of that disease, which, unwittingly, they nourished to their constant detriment and obstinately cherished to their own mysterious destruction.[m]

By the aid of this interpreter the history of the past is more understandingly read, and statesmanship, with reference to the future, presents a more definite aim, as well as a brighter light by which to guide our hopes and direct our exertions.

Read now a part of the second chapter of Merivale's History of Rome and we understand how Rome became so great. Read what is said by historians of her in respect to poverty later in her career, and we can both understand the "how" and the "why" of her fall:

"The first mythology of Rome and Italy is connected with the great social revolution introduced into the country

days the Republic of Venice was noted for the moderation, chastity and virtue of its people. Riches, honor and ambition had no charms for them—all lived upon a familiar equality. Property was common to all, and devoted to the public benefit. Merit was the only distinction, and that alone was esteemed true nobility which was acquired by virtue. Under such happy auspices did *this* Republic receive her first laws, ordinances and regulations; upon such a foundation she grew up to be a great maritime power; into her treasury flowed the commerce and wealth of the East. She ruled the Mediterranean, took Constantinople, and set bounds to the Ottoman power at a moment when it seemed ready to overwhelm all Europe."—*Fisk's Travels in Italy.*

[m]"In about two hundred years the Athenians raised themselves from the condition of a rude and scarcely civilized people to the highest summit which any nation has yet reached—the culminating point of human intelligence. Conceive that rate of progress continued instead of stopping short, and applied to all departments of man's capacity and wants, instead of to a few only, and what might our race not have been now?—*Realizable Ideals, W. R. Gregg.*

by the earliest attempts at husbandry. Saturnus, the most ancient of the Italian divinities, is the god of sowing; his name betokens the change from the life of the hunter to the life of the husbandman, from the habits of mere nomad existence to those of settled habitation, and therewith of civil polity. The age of Saturn becomes a landmark in the national traditions. It is remembered as the close of the period of perpetual warfare, the inauguration of an era of peace and civility. The age of Saturn is the Age of Gold. Saturn becomes the eponym of all useful and humane discovery. He is the inventor of the art of horticulture as well as of agriculture. His consort, Ops, is the representative of wealth, with which he is forever associated. The scythe he wields in the later mythologies as the God of Time, the Destroyer, is more properly the hook with which he teaches men to prune their fruit trees, to mow their grass and to gather in their corn. The age of Saturn, again, is an age of innocence and simplicity, of modesty and honest labor, such as becomes the life of the fields and pastures. It is an era of rustic equality, where every one toiled for himself and gained his living by the work of his own hands, not by that of dependents and bondsmen. The festival of the Saturnalia, when the slaves of a later age were allowed for a few days all the license of free men, reminded the Romans of this happy period of common interests and universal freedom."[n]

[n]Among the laws they had made for the honor and security of the marriage state they had made no provision for divorce; in the good old time the contingency of a crime which could burst the bonds of honorable marriage had not occurred to their imagination. Prior to the time of Spurius Cornelius (B. C. 231,) wives had been repudiated but never divorced."*—*Merwall's Rome.*

*"Our forefathers (by the force of whose virtues we are now supported in our vices,) lived every jot as well as we, when they provided and dressed their own meat with their own hands; lodged upon the ground, and were not as yet come to the vanity of gold and gems; when they swore by their earthen gods and kept their oath though they died for it." —*Seneca on a Happy Life, Sir Roger L'Estrange's Translation.*

Compare the foregoing with the following from the pen of the same writer, describing another period in Roman history:

"In vain had the forms of the Roman constitution been steadily moulded in the direction of Democracy. The circumstances of society had meanwhile worked much more effectually in the opposite direction. Rome had fallen more and more under the actual control of a small number of wealthy proprietors, who, partly by corruption and partly by force, made themselves masters of the State under the form of a liberal Republic. * * * * The era which now opens upon us completed in the course of another half century the demoralization of the Romans, and afflicted the most grievous sufferings upon the world around them." (B.C. 200-150.)

And in the following passages from Gibbon we may learn the same secret of Roman virtue and Roman greatness; of a government which founded in Democracy actual, not merely nominal, and where all had free access to land, attained a permanence it took centuries of empire to overthrow:

"And to the agrarian laws of an earlier period we can trace those virtues, that happiness and that prosperity, the memory of which so lingered in the Roman mind."

"The primitive government of Rome was composed, with some political skill, of an elective king, a council of nobles, and a general assembly of the people. War and religion we administered by the supreme magistrate, and he alone proposed the laws, which were debated in the Senate and finally ratified or rejected by a majority of votes in the thirty *curiæ* or parishes of the city."—*Vol. III., p.* 647.

"Except in the singular institutions of Sparta, the wisest (!) legislatures have disapproved agrarian law as a false and dangerous innovation. Among the Romans the enormous disproportion of wealth surmounted the ideal restraints of a doubtful tradition, and an obsolete statute; a

tradition that the poorest followers of Romulus had been endowed with the perpetual inheritance of two *jugera;* a statute which confined the richest citizen to the measure of five hundred *jugera*, or three hundred and twelve acres of land." —*Vol. III., p.* 659.

CHAPTER XII.

IMPORTANCE TO US OF THE SUBJECT.

The wealth of Athens in her most flourishing era, consisted of a scanty sum of twelve hundred pounds sterling, possessed by twenty-one thousand male citizens of adult age. *Gibbon, Vol. IV, p.* 178.

That we are correct in ascribing poverty to be due to private ownership of land will, we think, now be admitted. And our knowledge of this fact is not knowledge of a vague or trivial value; on the contrary, it is knowledge of the most momentous importance. With this key in our possession, we are enabled to account for much that is melancholy or beautiful in the past history of nations. With this fact admitted, we are able to comprehend why nations, at times, make such advances in civilization, while, at other times, they seem to recede from the goal of happiness and virtue, rather than to near it, in spite of the opportunity that has been afforded them by time. And this fact accepted, resolves the problem of ethics, and enables us to raise the study of sociology into a science.

It is the one factor which, if unrecognized, will make all our anticipations of the future of the world wild, chimerical and variously delusive; it is the one factor which, recognized and accepted, will enable us not only to eradicate the diseases of modern civilization, but will enable us to predict the future of any country.

Given a nation with a constitutional government, with education diffused among the people, and if the condition of that people is not one of happiness and virtue, we may know at once, without the least knowledge of the past or present history of that people, without any reference to race or nationality, without any regard to their religion, that land is subject to private ownership.

This being the condition of a nation, as a rule, the quantity of land to the quantity of people will make little difference in the result, generally; that condition will be worse when the people are numerous and the land circumscribed in quantity, but, ordinarily, the proportion of one to the other is of little matter. For even where the number of people is small compared to the number of acres, when the right of an individual to own land is recognized, there generally exists some reason to make individuals desire to own and control as much as possible, and thus exclusion of many from the soil is the consequence. Thus, according to Merivale:

"These two peninsulas," (Greece and Italy) "which project so deeply into the Mediterranean, had both been famous at an earlier period for their crops of grain, and the dense population they nourished at the foot of their rugged mountains. But that was a time when both these regions were divided into numerous petty States, *and occupations of land were necessarily small.* Both, however, were peculiarly adapted to the nurture of cattle. They abounded in cool pastures among the mountains for the summer, and warmer tracts of level land for the winter. As soon as political restrictions were shaken off properties became enlarged, and embraced tracts of both hill and plain together. Then first these countries began to reap the fruits of their natural capabilities. Proprietors found it to their interest to breed cat-

tle in greater numbers, and to reduce in the same proportion their cultivation of grain. An attempt to check by legislation the course of this natural process, could hardly fail to be attended with disastrous consequences."

"The problem, indeed, admitted no peaceable solution. To restrain the free cultivation of Italy by the assignments of lands to a few thousand free proprietors, was a chimera. To leave the soil to the cultivation of slaves, was to perpetuate and intensify a plague-spot, which could not fail to issue in the corruption of the whole body. But the emancipation of the servile caste and the abolition of slavery were ideas entirely beyond the scope of the political reasoning of the ancients."[a]

Had our author turned his attention to Russia, or the United States, he would have perceived what little benefit emancipatian of slaves and serfs can produce. Mr. Merivale saw the true remedy no more than did those ancients of whom he wrote.

"In the 15th century in England, when the population *hardly exceeded five millions*, there was much distress among the poor. The rise in the price of wool was giving a fresh impulse to the changes in agriculture which had begun with the Black Death, and were to go steadily on for a hundred years to come. These changes were the throwing together of the smaller holdings and the introduction of sheep farming on an enormous scale. The new wealth of the merchant classes helped on the change. They began to invest largely in land, and these "farming gentlemen," and "clerking knights," as Latimer bitterly styled them, were restrained by few traditions or associations in their evictions of the smaller tenants."

"The land, indeed, had been greatly under-let, and as its value rose with the peace and firm government of the early

[a]Merivale's Rome, p. 220.

Tudors, the temptation to raise the customary rent became irresistible."[b]

"Increase of rent ended, with such tenants as Latimer's father, in the relinquishment of their holdings, but the bitterness of the ejection which the new system of cultivation necessitated, was increased by the iniquitous means that were often employed to bring them about."

"The farmers," if we believe Moore, in 1515, were 'got rid of either by fraud or force, or tired out with repeated wrongs into parting with their property. In this way it comes to pass that these poor wretches, men, women, husbands, orphans, widows, parents with little children, households, greater in number than in wealth—for farming arable land requires many hands, while one shepherd and herds-

[b]"With peace and security and the wealth they brought with them, the value of land, and with it the rental of every country gentleman (again) rose fast. Estates which were rented at two thousand a year, three score years ago," said Burke, in 1776, "are at three thousand at present." Very fine, indeed, but before these prosperous times Burton had written *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, and within a few years after Hood wrote *The Lay of the Laborer*, and *The Song of the Shirt*. In the nineteenth century "with peace and security, and the wealth (?) they brought with them," the value of the land had increased to such an extent that Mr. McCulloch, the statistical writer concluded that the twelve millions of acres in England, that are cultivated, have an annual value of £72,000,000, and the seventeen millions of pasture land £59,000,000 with the result, that "there is a larger number of paupers in England than in any of the other countries of Europe," and the future of English agriculture presents a very "serious" and dreary outlook. The Church of England, in the meanwhile, spends £1,000,000 a year in church building, and church restoration, and raises, by voluntary subscription, over twenty-seven millions of dollars for her curates and other such luxuries of civilization. And it has been announced in the papers, as a matter of congratulation, that the "Bristol" restaurant has been started by a Parisian, and England is, therefore, "redeemed from the reproach" of not having a first-class institution of that kind. Henceforward, it is proclaimed, that for $2.50 an excellent dinner can be had."

man will suffice for a pasture farm—all these emigrate from their native fields without knowing where to go. The sale of their scanty household stuff drove them to wander homeless abroad, to be thrown into prison as vagabonds, to beg or to steal.' Yet, in the face of such a spectacle as this, we still find the old complaint of scarcity of labor, and the old legal remedy for it in a fixed scale of wages. The social disorder in fact baffled the sagacity of English statesmen, and they could find no better remedy for it than laws against the further extension of sheep farms, and a formidable increase of public executions. Both were alike fruitless. Enclosures and evictions went on as before, and swelled the numbers and the turbulence of the floating labor class. The riots against "enclosures" of which we first hear in the time of Henry the Sixth, and which became a constant feature of the Tudor period, are indications, not only of a perpetual strife going on in every quarter between the landlords and the smaller peasant class, but of a mass of social discontent which was to seek constant outlets in violence and revolution. And into this mass of disorder the break-up of the military households, and the return of wounded and disabled soldiers from the wars, introduced a dangerous leaven of outrage and crime. England, for the first time, saw a distinct criminal class in the organized gangs of robbers which began to infest the roads, and were always ready to gather around the standard of revolt. The gallows did their work in vain. 'If you do not remedy the evils which produce thieves,' Moore urged with bitter truth, 'the rigorous execution of justice in punishing thieves, will be vain.' But even Moore could only suggest a remedy, which, efficacious (!) as it was subsequently to prove, had yet to wait a century for its realization: 'Let the woolen manufactures be introduced so that honest employment may be found for those whom want has made thieves, or will make thieves ere long.'

"The extension of industry at last suceeded in absorbing this mass of surplus labor, but, the process was not com-

plete (!) till the close of Elizabeth's day (?) and throughout the time of the Tudors the discontent of the labor class bound the wealthier classes to the crown. It was, in truth, this social danger which lay at the root of the Tudor despotism."

"For the proprietary classes, the repression of the poor was a question of life and death. Employer and proprietor were ready to surrender freedom into the hands of the one power which could preserve them from social anarchy. It was to the selfish panic of the land-owners that England owed the statute of laborers, and its terrible heritage of pauperism. It was to the selfish panic of both land-owners and merchants that she owed the despotism of the monarchy."[c]

So much light, then, does the recognition of the truth in this matter throw upon the past. And if we use this fact in estimating the condition of nations at the present time, it will be found as sure an index of the happiness enjoyed by a people, or of the unhappiness of their condition.

"A correspondent of the Philadelphia *Bulletin* writing from Carlsbad says: The Bohemian girl as she appears on her native soil does not look as if she ever dreamt of marble halls, as did the girl of the late Mr. Balfe's opera. She begins life swathed in a stiff pillow to straighten and strengthen her back. Soon after she begins to walk she takes lessons in bearing burdens on this back, and by the time she reaches womanhood can carry a ten gallon cask of water, or a huge basket filled with firewood or soiled clothes, up a steep hill twenty or thirty times, without stopping to rest. Advancing in years she may be hitched with a cow or a big dog to pull a market wagon, driven by her beloved and loving husband. If she is a very good wife she may be advanced to the dignity of being the off-horse, with a dog for the near one, to haul a coalcart to a customer's door, and when she unhitches herself she carries in a pannier the rusty looking coal of this

[c] J. R. Green's History of English People.

country up one, two or three pairs of stairs, while the man and dog repose in the street. It is thus that the native Bohemian girl often fulfills her destiny in this historic and chivalric land. Woman is the drudge and the beast of burden here, as in many other parts of the Continent. There are fine horses for drawing heavy vehicles, and there are donkeys that pull fat dowagers or lazy little boys up the hills. But there are no equestrian displays. A riding horse is more rarely seen in Carlsbad than a pretty German woman, and yet there are scores of cavaliers in cavalry uniforms and wearing spurs that ought to be pricking the sides of the best blooded steeds of the Orient. But there is not much need of horses in a country where women are the laborers, and the pleasure horse is an expensive luxury."[d]

And in explanation of the *why* of this sad condition of affairs, it is not necessary to ask are the Bohemians Christians or Mahometans, Protestant or Catholics. The following clipped from the columns of the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, of December 30th, 1881, contains the explanation, and shows it to be the consequence when the right of individuals to own land is incorporated in the structure of society, and recognized and allowed by law.

"At the recent annual hunt on the vast dominions of Prince Schwartzenburg, in Bohemia, four hares were bagged. The expenditure for maintenance, etc., amounting to 8,417 florins per annum, each hare cost the owner 2,105 florins 15 kreuzers."

So, too, in contemplating the present condition of England and Ireland, we can readily account for the poverty and misery in those countries, and for that competition

[d]Comparisons are odious, nevertheless compare the above with the following: "Agricultural work among the Aztecs was chiefly done by men; the women scattering the seed, husking the corn and taking part only in the lighter labors of the field.—*Prescott's Conquest of Mexico, Vol. I, p.* 134.

which is so intense, and which, in its consequences is so hardening and demoralizing, and in its results to the whole nation, so pernicious and baneful, as due, and necessarily, to this cause also. And if we desire to estimate the amount of vice and misery in England and Ireland, and the amount of danger that is threatening the existing order of affairs, and which is casting such a "cloud"[e] over the future of these countries, we will find the means to this estimation in the fact that four-fifths of English soil is owned by less than two per cent. of her population—and that in Ireland, with a population of some five millions, nineteen thousand persons own nearly all the land.

But, admitting all that we have said to be true, and that England and Ireland owe all their troubles to private ownership of land—admitting that Rome to this cause owed her destruction, and to the same England may owe her desolation, the question may present itself to us—what have we in America to fear? With a "boundless domain," with every variety of soil and climate, with our thousand industries, with our constitution and free ballot, what consideration need we give to the slow operation of causes, which, if ultimately detrimental, can scarcely affect for many years the stability of the civilization of which we are so proud?

In our endeavor to find out the practical value to us in the United States of the conclusions arrived at, in the preceding chapters, we must keep in mind this fact, that the necessity for action or anxiety, on our part, in this matter, will be immediate and considerable, or otherwise, as we, after examination, shall determine to what extent these evils, which we have shown to be the results of private ownership in land, are now upon us. If we find these symp-

[e] See Green's Sketches in England and Italy.

toms numerous, we may justly suspect that the same cause that produced them elsewhere is producing them here also.

And, secondly, by ascertaining by actual inquiry, how much and what is the quality of this "boundless domain" still in the possession of the people.

And if the result of our investigation should show that poverty, competition, vice and unhappiness, are on the increase, and also a constant diminution of this government land, we certainly have incumbent upon us one of two very serious duties: either to show that poverty, vice and misery are not occasioned by exclusion of the people from the soil; or it becomes us, and that quickly, to devise some method by which this exclusion will be prevented for the future, and its past results remedied in the present. For those very causes which have made us so conspicuous for our sudden growth and development and for our unexampled prosperity in the past, good government, education and competence, when they were combined, will, when this latter factor ceases to be general, and becomes impossible for many to attain, be the cause of our as equally surprising decay. Education is more potent to produce baneful results, to concoct and to complete revolutions, to conceive and to execute conspiracies, than ignorance. And these methods education will resort to, if circumstances force, in the direction of violence and conspiracy, the attention and the hopes of that constantly increasing educated majority, who may think that in violence and revolution they see the cure for real or fancied wrongs. The civilizations of the past have continued long, because, in spite of their one-sided and unnatural development, the power of the State has always been guided and wielded by the wealth of the State. And the education of the State, what little education there was, was

of a practical, superficial kind, that always centered in the hands of the wealthy few; and the ignorance of the masses has been so great that they failed to grasp the causes of their ruler's continued power, and hence, being excluded from the councils of the nation, were quiescent under such laws and such government as chance, ambition or policy determined,or—revolted in segments, and were easily suppressed.

Even in England, a hundred years ago, the ignorance of the people was extreme and startlingly universal.[1] And this ignorance, and the horrible laws enacted against the poor, together with the partial and temporary amelioration of their condition by manufactures, of which England for so many years enjoyed a virtual monopoly over the rest of the world, prevented in many cases, and distracted in many more, the attention of the people from the investigation of the causes which education is but now revealing to them, were the means which, in spite of incessant work, kept them constantly poor.'

And our very form of government, while the best for any new government in a new country, and best for a society in whose structure all the requirements for unlimited growth are present, will be the means, in a society not rightly balanced in all its departments, of its speedy overthrow and disintegration. For our government, uniting in its science of society, liberty, law and education, has quickly achieved a greatness which was as complete, for awhile, as if we had united with them a correct basis for our system of political economy. For as land was, for years, in excess of demand, it was immaterial whether we made it private property or not. But, as soon as by the operation of favorable causes,

[1]England had fallen into an abyss of ignorance. *McKenzie's 19th Century.*

we reached a point of population and wealth that made it desirable that land should be free, we began to feel the bad results of our previous oversight.

A soldier does not take water with him on a long march, because of the fear of thirst in the first hours of fatigue, and if his march was only to continue an hour, or, if apprised of the fact that springs would be in abundance all along his route, he need not take any with him at all. But when wells and springs and rivers are not to be found, in the heat of the day he will not only find out his mistake—if he has omitted this precaution—but will also discover how impotent to provide for this deprivation are all substitutes, or all other resources forethought may have placed at his command.

In the United States we have received our ideas of property and "order" from England, and our men of property and our statesmen endeavor to mold our social development after the traditions inherited from her. We forget that the characteristic feature of English society and of English law was produced by the legislative action of English lords and bishops, or her large real estate owners, and that in the election of these to represent the people of England, only those were allowed the ballot who owned more or less wealth, in lands or money, and whose interest in consequence was identical with that of the greater lords and land owners, in repressing the true sentiments and desires of the mass of the people of England.[8]

[8] "As late as the reign of George III., out of a population of eight millions of English people, only a hundred and sixty thousand were electors at all."—*G. R. Green's History of the English People.* And says the historian from whom we have quoted: "We can hardly wonder that a reformer could allege without a chance of denial, 'This house is not a representative of Great Britain. It is the representative of nominal bor-

Where the suffrage is universal the attempt to maintain the old ideas of property will be useless, and the old cry of "law and order" will be vain when the majority have no interest in property that once made this appeal so effective.

A democratic form of government will be fatal to the continuation of liberty in proportion as the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few shall make political careers desirable to the ambitious or necessary to the *ennuied*, and shall make bribery possible; and in proportion as the growing poverty of the many shall make the pursuit of politics by its proffered rewards a vocation to be followed by those whose ambition or necessities exceed their means or their conscientiousness, and shall render bribery acceptable. Says De Quincey:

"In the contest of Cæsar with the oligarchic knavery of Cicero, Cato and Pompey, no possible exercise of representative functions (had the people possessed them) could have been applied beneficially to the settlement of the question at issue. Law, and the abuse of law, good statutes and evil customs, had equally thrown the public power into a settlement fatal to the public welfare. Not any decay of public virtue, (De Quincey is evidently here mistaken, there must have been a decay of virtue; he rightly gives the cause of this decay, however,) but increase of poverty among the inferior citizens, had thrown the suffrage and consequently the honors and power of the State into the hands of some forty or fifty houses rich enough to bribe, and bribing systematically."[h]

oughs, of ruined and exterminated towns, of noble families, of wealthy individuals, of foreign potentates.'" "The present House of Commons, though supposed to represent thirty-five millions of people, is really elected by a little over three millions."—*The Coming Revolution in England, H. N. Hyndman in North American Review for October*, 1882.

[h]On Christianity as an Organ of Political Movement.

Observe what he says, good laws and good statutes, under the circumstances mentioned, were not only inoperative for good but potent for evil.

A tree, prevented by a wall from attaining its full natural development, will assume a shape unnatural and distorted in proportion to the very vitality of the force it may have originally possessed. The government capable of the highest development, if circumstances are favorable, will result in the worst form if circumstances are adverse. And especially is it true that in a democratic representative government the forces of contending parties will always be primarily directed to the regulation or removal of those disadvantages which press most heavily upon their particular factional interest, or to the obtaining of those results most desirable to their state or agreeable to their ambition, while all parties will unite in a general denunciation of any who, careless of the interest of parties, or of politicians, shall direct the attention of the people to the examination of those systems which result in producing politicians by profession and representatives by "pressure" or by fraud. Then will senators forget their internal dissensions, to combine against this, a common, foe.

A king or emperor may be guided in the administration of government, and in the dispensing of justice, by high, disinterested and abstract principles; many rulers have been so guided in the past. But in the legislation of numbers, in all highly developed societies, private interest, or social or political aggrandizement, is always the motive power of the majority, and hence, on issues where these interests are at stake, patriots may protest, and statesmen may warn, but the *majority rules.*

And then, again, under a democratic form of government

the form is often taken for the substance, and through fear of endangering liberty, or from over confidence in her supposed secure possession, and from a disinclination to tamper with their Constitution, and with an abiding faith in the ultimate powers of progress to correct abuses, much will be submitted to by the people which, under a personal government, the same amount of education prevailing among the masses, would not be tolerated for a moment.

And in seeking for these symptoms which, by their presence, will indicate the existence of a secret but powerful cause of probable ultimate decay, we, in the United States, have unfortunately not far to go. We all know how rapidly the bosses of small shops are being transformed into the tinkers of the villages, the day laborers or journeymen of our cities. The factories are swallowing up the craftsmen of the country.

Regarding the matter of competition, we are made every day to see what a struggle existence has become to all. How difficult for our small shopkeepers to make a living, without resorting to equivocation and subterfuge, to gasconade or flattery. How adulteration of almost every article has become almost if not quite a necessity, and misrepresentation, direct or indirect, all but universal. Advertising becoming more and more a matter of colors, catch words and magnitude; voluminous and glaring in proportion as they are unreliable.

We see one daily paper[i] in one of our largest cities terming life a "battle," and in another city,[j] a dealer in merchandise "defying competition," and declaring his intention of "pouring hot shot into the ranks" of those who sell the

[i]Globe-Democrat, of St. Louis.

[j]Mempis, Tennessee.

same class of goods; thus corroborating, unconsciously, from his commercial standpoint the conclusions of the more philosophic editorial.

We see an army of an hundred thousand traveling men seeking, in every hamlet and village, customers for their houses; we know of large merchants and manufacturers cutting or pooling as financial interests or necessities dictate, and we see by the side of all this how alarming and how pressing is becoming the condition of the ever increasing poor.

Hundreds are ruined monthly by speculation, hundreds by competition, hundreds by dishonesty, while operators in margins are constantly increasing in numbers. "Spots" and "futures," "puts" and "calls," have become household words, and nothing is exempt from the enterprise or the rapacity of these speculators. Cotton or corn, wheat or sugar, bacon or nails, lard or bonds, all things are "beared" or "bulled," inflated or depressed, by syndicates or monopolists, and a death, a rumor, or an unscrupulous manipulation may make, in an hour, the unwholesome fortune of hundreds, or swallow up the competence of thousands.

Our penitentiaries are filled with convicts, rendered respectable by the number of rich men who, by the force of expiring public indignation, have been brought to grief through their reckless rascality and extreme egotism; and by the number of religious men with whom embezzlements and defalcations, treachery and violence are becoming so common; and by the number of professional men, or gentlemanly idlers, whom competition, or speculation, or poverty have forced to become adventurers and law-breakers. Our daily papers teem with the horrid details of countless sui-

cides;[k] our cities are over-run with sharpers, beggars, imposters, thieves and prostitutes, in proportion to their age and wealth, and are corrupt in proportion to their civilization.[l]

And every suicide, and every bankrupt, every embezzlement, every beggar, every impostor, every thief, and every prostitute, represents not only the product of misery and

[k] "The late alarming prevalence of suicide is attracting renewed and general attention to the old, perplexing question that has haunted reflective minds for thousands of years. In all ages self-slaughter has been looked upon with popular disfavor, not to say execration; and yet, in all ages, men and women have gone on killing themselves. At present, it is said by those who have made a study of the subject, the ratio of annual increase in suicides is really greater than the ratio of increase in population. The statistics show that in France 6,000 persons die yearly by their own hands; in Prussia, 4,500; in Austria, 2,600; in England, 1,700; in Italy, 1,100; and in the United States about the same as in England. And these figures are constantly increasing, it is said, not in the way of transient epidemics of mania, referable to particular causes, but as regular daily occurrences, of which it is impossible to evolve a sufficient and definite explanation."—*Globe-Democrat, Dec.* 11, '81.

[l] "An industrious statistician has been engaged in comparing the sexual crimes reported in "cultured" Massachusetts for the four years of 1866-9 and those during the four years of 1876-9. The exhibit is anything but complimentary to the morality of the Bay State. Among the the tables presented are the following:

	1866-9.	1876-9.
Crimes against chastity in Massachusetts	683	1,537
Illegitimate births	1,625	2,766
Divorces	1,352	2,255
Marriages	57,551	52,202

The total population in 1870 was 1,457,200, and was but 1,783,012 ten years later. It is observed that the crimes, illegitimate births and divorces increased much more rapidly than did the population of the State during the decade, while the number of marriages grew alarmingly less. Claiming to be a veritable Vestal in chastity, the home of the Pilgrim Fathers is developing into a Pariah."—*Cincinnati Enquirer, Jan.* 27, '82.

vice, but, in themselves, are the blighting causes of unhappiness and abject misery, sorrow and desolation, to all connected with them, either as fathers or mothers, sisters or brothers, wives or children.

Think of the appalling shadow of gloom and anguish the figure of one poor, nameless woman may cast on all who have loved and cherished or honored her in her happier days of innocence and purity.

Our pauper and criminal classes are increasing in a most alarming manner. Tramps are becoming so numerous that they may be reckoned by thousands. Says the *Missouri Republican* (Oct. 21, '81):

"Twenty years ago pauperism was a word that we hardly knew the meaning of in the West, an able-bodied man who begged his living from door to door, was a curiosity that excited downright amazement. Now mendicants abound everywhere, in towns, villages and cities. They swarm in the streets and highways and there are but few houses that are not honored with a visit from them once a day. In fact, voluntary pauperism has become a favorite profession, whose devotees, already numerous, are continually multiplying under the easy conditions of living without work in this country." (Query—is it the easy conditions of living without work in England, that is the cause that paupers are more abundant in England than in the United States? And if yes, are these conditions *so much* easier in England as to account for the far greater number of paupers?) "In New York pauperism increased 600 per cent., from 1850 to 1880, although the population only doubled in the same time; and there is hardly a community in the country in which every man who works for his living does not feel the sometimes severe task of having to divide his earnings, in one form or another, with those who do not."

These are they who, constantly multiplying, form that mystic hoard of tramps of whom De Cassagnac says, that

being the descendants of freedmen, they cannot become "gentlemen", and are doomed by fate to tramp through all eternity, seeking rest and finding it not.

But, beware! These "Arabs" of our cities and of the country, may have been prophetically—ominously named. These tramps are being educated, are absorbing new ideas from the very atmosphere in which they move,[m] and when they become a little more numerous, and have digested their reflections a little more thoroughly, the institutions and the properties, those "venerable and sacred vested rights" included, may find in educated poverty a different foe from those ignorant masses who have suffered in such pathetic silence, or were murdered by law in such countless numbers, through the long agony of the terrible past, because of their

[m]Such utterances, for instance, as the following, taken from Mr George's "*Poverty and Progress*" are now being deeply pondered over by the laboring classes, and the results of their meditations are likely any day to manifest themselves: "Consider for a moment the utter absurdity of the titles by which we permit to be gravely passed from John Doe to Richard Roe the right to exclusively possess the earth, giving absolute dominion as against all others. In California our land titles go back to the Supreme Government of Mexico, who took from the Spanish King, who took from the Pope, when he by a stroke of the pen divided lands yet to be discovered between the Spanish or Portuguese--or, if you please, they rest upon conquest. In the Eastern States they go back to treaties with Indians and grants from English Kings; in Louisiana to the Government of France; in Florida to the Government of Spain; while in England they go back to the Norman conquerors. Everywhere, not to a right that obliges, but to a force which compels. And when a title rests but on force, no complaint can be made when force annuls it. Whenever the people, having the power, choose to annul those titles, no objection can be made in the name of Justice. There have existed men who had the power to hold or to give exclusive possession of portions of the earth's surface, but when and where did there exist the human being that had the

ignorance and poverty, or their reverence, or their superstition, or their piety.

Those religious scruples, or that ignorance which protected the tombs and temples of St. Paul and St. Peter, when the superstitious Goths and Vandals and Lombards besieged Constantinople, five hundred years of a literary civilization had taught the Saracens to forget or to despise. And when ideas, now fast disseminating, have become a little more clearly cut into practical working shape, and our common schools have done their office a little longer, the altars of Mammon and the temple of Hypocrisy, the iron palaces and the marble residences of to-day, may meet at the hands of the educated "Arabs" of to-day the fate that the tombs and temples of the Apostles met at the hands of the Arabs ten hundred years ago.

right?" Page 307. Note also the following from Mr. George Iles' paper in the *Popular Science Monthly* for June, 1882:

"Popular discontent has in all ages been a dangerous thing, but how much more so than ever now, when a numerical majority—that is the poor—control legislation; elect the executive and levy taxes. In the last analysis the rights of property depend upon the popular will, and the people can readily modify existing rights in what way they may take to be the general good. Fourier and Saint Simon did not speak to a nation enjoying universal sufferage, nor were Utopias ever preached to men who might practically attempt their establishment. The wide diffusion of popular knowledge through the schools, the press and the platform, in these later days, has made the discussion of such questions as that before us very general and very earnest."

And when to all this we add the fact that such men as Sir Henry Maine and M. Laveleye have devoted much time and study to the land question, and have announced that the primitive culture of land was communal, we may see that it behooves us to squarely face the subject and endeavor to adjust our social fabric on a a basis that will best evade or breast the coming storm—surely in store for us.

And that we are on the eve of some great revolution or catastrophe all appearances indicate. The strikes so constantly re-occurring, and with every occurrence showing better organization and more settled purpose; the riots among our railway laborers, the troubles with our miners; the Unions everywhere so noticeable of all kinds of craftsmen; their system and their determination—show that the poor are beginning to combine for their own protection, or for aggressions, and how those who never thought are now beginning to think, and in place of their time honored position as pupils, they are quite willing and remarkably able to assume the position of teachers of new systems of political economy.

And we can get but little hope from the farmers to offset this dread picture, so prophetic of turbulence and possible disaster ahead. The farmers themselves will, in great measure and numbers, favor any well digested plan that promises relief for the future.

"For the Granger movement in the West was, in its very recent day, a significant indication in the same direction. The producers of grain saw the profits of their labor melt away under the grasping demands of great corporations—corporations which enriched their stockholders, and left the farming and producing interest insufficiently rewarded.—The farmers worked hard and did not get rich—did not get the mortgages off their farms—while railroad men grew into railroad kings, with millions at their command, and with the power, by the writing of their names or by breathing a word, or by making a combination with other kings, to squeeze every bushel that passed through their hands still tighter in their exactions of toll.

"A few weeks or months ago, a meeting was held in this city (New York) in the interest of an anti-monopoly movement. No matter how unwise its declarations may have been, it was an indication of the same discontent in which the

Granger movement originated. It was the protest of private persons, hopeless against the exactions and despotisms of monopolies and combinations of monopolies. They had seen great corporations doubling their capital stock, and insisted on filching dividends out of the people for that which cost them absolutely nothing.

"They had seen this again and again. They had seen men made superfluously rich at their expense. They had felt the exercise of the power of monopolies upon their prosperity, and they protested against this power. They felt that they had no chance against these gigantic combinations which not only had the power, at any moment, to deprive them of the profits of their industry, but also to purchase or dictate the laws necessary to keep them secure in their enormous privileges."—(*Scribner for July*, 1881.)

In view of the power and wealth of monopolies, the question presents itself, *who are* these monopolists, and *how* did they acquire their great wealth and enormous power?

Some there are who by the invention of a revolver, a patent medicine, a sewing machine, or a sleeping car,[n] have become magnates in the land; some by successful business, or by successful speculation, have become the arbiters of the fashions and threaten to be the directors of the destinies of the nation; and for which laudable and beneficent ends these

[n] "George M. Pullman, although not yet 50 years of age, owns property estimated at over $15,000.000."—*Globe-Democrat, December* 30, 1881.

"The freest government," said Daniel Webster, "cannot long endure where the tendency of the laws is to create a rapid accumulation of property in the hands of the few, and to render the masses of the people poor and dependent." There were no railroad, bonanza, cotton, provision and whisky giants in Daniel Webster's day. He would be astonished if he could see the boy who gloried in being the proprietor of a patent mouse trap in his day, now purchasing 10,000 or 12,000 miles of railroads as merchant princes purchase cargoes of sugar, flour, coffee and other merchandise, and wielding a capital of six or seven hundred millions of

already wealthy men desire to become yet richer, and by combinations they endeavor to control manufactures and markets, to rule or ruin all competition.°

In the meanwhile, these men, by their actions or examples, have ruined thousands who have lost where they have won; or, encouraged by their reward, have frittered away money, and embittered their own and many other dependent lives in attempting the same success; or have been exterminated, commercially speaking, by the peculiar or fortunate, or accidental methods of their successful rivals. Thus these monopolists, these over-rich corporations, in many instances the individuals forming which are excellent companions and kind fathers and husbands, but cormorants in their collective capacity or business relations, as regards the

dollars, and to see Vanderbilt and many other capitalists adding to their estates in ten years from five to fifty millions of dollars. The question is beginning to be considered by thinking men: "Where did Mr. Vanderbilt get so much money in so short a time? Where did these vast fortunes come from? How much value received have these men, with vast wealth so suddenly made, given in exchange for these fortunes? What is to be the upshot of these gold rings that encircle the cotton and provisions, political parties, Congress and State Legislatures, and in a great measure control the muscle, skill and brain of this 'land of the free and home of the brave?'"

°"A late special mentions Representative Henderson, of Illinois, who recently introduced a bill in the House to regulate inter-state commerce, as saying he intends to devote considerable energy to the passage either of his bill or some other that will control and regulate railroad tariffs. He says a law of this kind is necessary to protect stockholders of railroads, as well as other classes of people; that as it now stands a few speculators and stock brokers band together and wreck almost any road they direct their efforts against; then they buy the depreciated property, and thus are rapidly getting control of all the railroads."—*Little Rock*, (*Ark.*,) *Gazette*, *January* 4, 1882.

interest of the people, represent a many-headed hydra of evil, they have almost, without exception, by their success in some phase of its progress, ruined, directly or indirectly, thousands in their struggle upward, by their fierce competition or reckless speculations, and thus have immeasurably increased the ranks of the miserable and the wicked. And now with wealth so acquired they attempt yet greater financial feats at the cost of all ranks of society. And by their influence and extravagance, by their methods and their manners, they not only increase the rivalry in display of the so-called upper classes, in which their wealth has, in many instances, enabled them to enter, but they demoralize the ideas and morals of countless youths, who otherwise would be satisfied, by a more prudent course, to acquire a competency once considered desirable, but compared with the fortunes sometimes to be won by more reprehensible but more splendid methods, altogether too contemptible for a young man of advanced ideas or aspiring ambition.

But these monopolists are as much the result of our present system of political economy as our beggars are. These two classes alike owe their existence to circumstances, and it is as idle to hope to eliminate the one by legislative enactments as it is useless to attempt to cure the other by laws or penal statute. These gentlemen who wield these millions of dollars do so generally because circumstances have enabled them by superior brain work to become the millionaires they are. In many instances they are generous, sociable and humane, and have attained their present condition by the concurrence of circumstances and intelligence. To adopt any system widely different from that which they use, would only result in making them the victims of others,

who, by the same circumstances, are impelled forward in the same direction.[p]

Mr Vanderbilt and Mr. Gould, if they did not watch every corner, and resort to every means, would only be ruined themselves, with no benefit to the public; and Mr. Jones, or Mr. Johnson would rise by their fall, and the public, by this change, might lose much and could gain nothing. It is the system and not the men we denounce.

But, eventually, when the result of the system will become a little more startling, it will be impossible for the majority of men to disunite the two, and these capitalists will be held responsible by the masses for a state of affairs which they will be credited with having created.[q]

And by the same system that creates monopolists our farmers are getting deeper and deeper into debt, and when a bad season overtakes them, or by some disaster they lose their crops, as in Minnesota by fire, and in the South by water, the general government is applied to for aid, for alms, for rations, and for what?—to enable them to live in order to continue the dreary struggle for existence.

And even when not drowned out by water, or burned out by fire, and crops have not proved a total failure but, where they are only "short," what little has been produced, has to go to the dealers to pay up debts incurred for bread and meat;

[p]"If Cæsar and Pompey had thought as Cato, others would have thought as Cæsar and Pompey."—*Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans, Montesquieu—Baker's Translation.*

[q]Just as the land owners of France were hated by the people. Just as the idea of slavery was incorporated by the many in the persons of the slave holders. Just as Puritanism in England, in the seventeenth century, rendered the name of Puritan an object of popular hatred. Just as his conception of the evils of polygamy has made David and Solomon detestable to Mr. Ingersoll.

debts that are heavy, because buying on credit, prices have been high. And in this year of grace, 1882, many farmers in the South and West, who have worked hard and long during the previous season cannot even pay the insignificant debt thus contracted, consequently many dealers cannot pay theirs, contracted with the large merchants, and thus failure and hard times is the result all through the *working parts of society.*

In the meanwhile they who make their money by speculation take advantage of this distress to make "corners," and to inflate or depress prices as their own interest may dictate, leaving what money that *is made* in the pockets of those who fatten off the ills of the community.

And while extravagance and ostentation are the result with those speculators who are successful in their ventures, countless numbers who fail, seeing what poor returns are to be obtained by farming, do not resort to work on farms for a living; and, lingering in our cities, either borrow money to renew their speculations or embezzle it for that purpose, while many who cannot do either become sharpers, frauds, confidence men, harpies on society. And others, yet again, accept situations as clerks, book-keepers or salesmen, to contaminate with their sketches of episodes in their former business all classes of salaried men with whom they may chance to associate; and are rendered miserable and disgusted with life themselves, because of the nearness of their approach to fortunes, and yet had missed the golden prize; by brooding over the "what might have been" and contrasting their dreams with the petty realities of life.

If we pass from classes to families, is not the same rotten, unhappy condition presented to our view? Those with the most money rendered miserable in their efforts to

retain or increase their wealth, and spurred by ambition or necessity, they, in the effort to retain their leadership, or to overtake some other richer millionaire, are tormented with envy or alarmed by every varying phase of the markets; while slander and misrepresentation are heaped upon them by their rivals, and curses and maledictions by their victims and the people generally.[r]

Then there is Thompson with $5,000 a year rendered miserable by his efforts to hold his own in display or by his impotence to rival Jones with $7,000.[s] Men on salaries spending all they can make on themselves or families, in the hope that fortune will come sooner or later in some mysterious way, or insure in some worthless company as a safeguard against the future, to find themselves swindled or their families cheated by the fraud or the "breakage" of the company. Wives and daughters of men commanding fair living salaries, are educated to idleness and expensive habits. If these daughters marry adventurers the ranks of the unhappy, and possibly the number of the vicious, are thus notably increased. If they marry poor men, too often poverty for the rest of their lives is the consequence to both.

[r] Says the Cincinnati *Times-Star*, March 27, '82: "Money does not bring misery, and it certainly does not always insure happiness. Witness the suicide of one millionaire and the attempted suicide of another within a week." Since this was written Mr. Cornelius Vanderbilt has also committed suicide, and attempts have been made on the lives of Mr. Field and Mr. Gould.

[s] "No greater misery than for a lord to have a knight's living, a gentleman a yeoman's, not to be able to live as his birth and place require. Poverty and want are generally corrosive, especially to such as have been in good and flourishing estate, and suddenly distressed; nobly born, liberally brought up, and by some disaster or casualty dejected."—*Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy*, p. 215.

Consequently, young men of moderate salaries and economical ideas are shunning matrimony when this probable result is presented as the price of marriage bliss. Our rich swells find in the poor women and girls of our cities companions too charming, and who can too easily be put aside when desired, to exchange the condition of bachelorhood for that of family men. In this connection read the following from *Our Continent*, March 1, '82:

"The Romans had a judicious law under which a bachelor was much more heavily taxed than a married man, and the latter the less heavily in proportion to the number of his children. Something of the same kind will have to be decreed in England, as the falling off in marriages is quite alarming. In 1872 there were 176 marriages celebrated for every 10,000 persons in the kingdom; in 1879 this number had sunk to 145; and in 1881 to 132. A gloomy statistician has reckoned that if this state of things keeps on, before the close of another century there will not be a single marriage celebrated in England!

This is indeed a frightful outlook, and although these statisticians are generally a pessimistic and scary set, one cannot escape the conclusion that something must be wrong in a society when marriage steadily decreases. Of course there are any number of doctors for this social malady, and all sorts of diagnoses are proffered and cure-alls suggested. One says it is because of the greatly increased expense of family life; another that the clubs are to blame, as they offer such excellent substitutes for the comforts of home; one ungallant and bilious critic charges it on the extravagance of the women whose expensive dress and habits scare off suitors; another, who, we may suppose, has "Confessions" to write, avers that it is the indolence, timidity, selfishness and general love of naughtiness in the young men that is at the root of the evil. Politeness and truth incline us to give a good deal of weight to this last mentioned honest man. At

any rate, what he says goes a long ways toward explaining the avoidance of matrimony in city life. * * *

This same fact is noted in New England and the eastern cities of the United States, so that it is not to us merely a matter for placid speculation like war to the burgher in Faust, when it was far off—*ganz weit, in der Turkei.* No, it is home business, an ugly growing canker in our own social life, and ought to attract the earnest attention of good men and women.

Juvenal refers to the distaste for marriage as one of the early signs of decay in the Roman State."

And even when men do marry, they live up to their incomes, and, consequently, when they die, or lose their situations, boarding-house keeping, or school teaching, or sewing at two dollars a week, or shame, are all that is left for the women, with further increase of unhappiness, vice and misery.

"Time and violence," said Gibbon, "tended constantly to decrease the numbers of the intermediate classes in France, leaving a constantly increasing number of those who were divided into the very rich and very poor." And is it not apparent to us that what time and violence effected in ancient France, with such disastrous ultimate results, rent, taxes, protection profits, and monopolistic profits, and credit profits, are now, and rapidly, effecting in our own fair country?

Read the following, clipped from one of our leading dailies, and remembering what has been shown of the condition of the country, is it to be wondered at if ere long the people, awakening to their rights and the wrongs so long perpetrated upon them under sanction of law, should begin to examine, to mutter, to threaten?

"Twenty or thirty years ago—say thirty—the richest man

in the United States was not worth more than Marcus Crassus, the richest man in Rome in the age of Pompey and Julius Cæsar—$10,000,000 to $15,000,000. When old Stephen Girard, of Philadelphia, died, it was said he was worth $15,000,000, but in fact he was not worth $10,000,000. He was then the wealthiest man in the country. When old Cornelius Vanderbilt died his estate was estimated at $40,000,000; a few years thereafter the Stewart estate was reckoned at $30,000,000. These were the richest men in the country ten or a dozen years ago, and there were hardly a score of othere worth as much as $10,000,000 each. What a change has taken place since the death of Vanderbilt! The wealth of his son, William H., is now reckoned above $100,000,000. Jay Gould, a bankrupt ten years back, is supposed to be worth $58,000,000; Stanford, Crocker, and the heirs of the estate of Mark Hopkins, range from $60,000,000 to $25,000,000 each. There died a man in New York the other day, Moses Taylor, whose property is variously stated at $30,000,000 to $50,000,000, and in his life he hardly attracted any attention as a man of wealth, so numerous have become those of equal rank in fortune. Twelve years ago the richest man in San Francisco was thought to be Wm. C. Ralston, and the aggregate of his possessions did not exceed $6,000,000. At that time two men kept an humble saloon on Washington street, between Montgomery and Sansome, whose whole possessions could not have been cashed for $25,000. They became partners of two other men in mines on the Comstock lode. Of the last two neither was rich. The aggregate wealth of the four did not reach $50,000. Now one of the first two is worth $30,000,000 and one of the last two supposed to be worth $60,000,000. A third is the richest man in the United States Senate, and the fourth died leaving an estate of $9,000,000 or more. It is stated on good authority that two brothers named Armour, made $7,000,000 in one year in a "corner" in pork. James R. Keene, in 1872, was a poor man in San Francisco—so poor that at times a $20 piece looked as big to him as a full moon. He is now rated a $15,000,000 nabob in New York, all of it

the result of eight or nine years' successful speculation. It took Stephen Girard a lifetime to make half as much, and yet he was accounted the sharpest and luckiest merchant of his time. About the year 1869 there went to California by way of the Central and Union Pacific Railways a party of visitors from Chicago. Among them was George Pullman, the inventor of the palace sleeping-car. He was then but an experimenter, an adventurer on the wave of fortune. He was understood to be worth a good deal less than nothing. His wealth is now established at $15,000,000 to $20,000,000, and increasing at a rate that will make it $50,000,000 if he lives ten years more.

"The luxury and perfection of detail in New York dwellings is passing into a proverb. Nowhere in the world, probably, is so much time and money expended upon the furnishing and ornamenting of the houses of the rich as in this city. The draping of curtains has become a distinct branch of art, and every decorator and upholsterer has one or more employes, whose sole business is to arrange in graceful folds the draperies, which are now indispensable, at doors, windows and fireplaces. Even the banisters must now be stuffed and tufted and draped on either side with heavy fringe. Ceilings are frescoed and painted in the studios of distinguished artists, and then transferred to the houses that they are to embellish. Hundreds of women are employed, at an expense of thousands of dollars, upon embroidery and art needlework which are to adorn the sumptuous palaces in which our rich men live. Paintings, statuary, carvings in stone and wood, the richest fabrics of French and Indian looms, indeed, all that is most rare and beautiful in nature and art, are brought to bear upon the decoration of these republican palaces. Even the stables in which the horses, coachmen and grooms are to be housed, are far more luxurious than the simple homes in which the fathers of our race passed their lives. The newly.finished stables of Mr. Cornelius Vanderbilt, in Fifty-eighth street, far outshine those of the Roman Emperor, whose sumptuous appointments have become a matter of history.

"Ned Stokes' bar, it is said, takes in $200 to $300 per day (or rather night), as it is patronized by a crowd of fast fellows, who drink nothing but high-priced liquors. A dinner at Delmonico's or Penard's can be had at from $5 to $40 per guest, according to the bill of fare and wine list. A number of dinner parties have been given during the past season in the Fifth Avenue in which $200 were expended in flowers alone. How easy to pay such bills when one's income is $1,000 per day, and this is not a large figure among our capitalists. But just look at the other side of social life: Four women were arraigned in the Police Court for selling vegetables and matches in baskets in the streets. One of the number said she was a widow with two children, and that this was their only suppart. The magistrate replied that it was a violation of law, and he was obliged to fine them $10 a piece, and as they were conveyed to the prison one of them fainted.

"Such contrasts may be found daily. Speaking of incomes, ex-Governor Morgan's is estimated at $500,000 a year. Russell Sage is rated at a million to a million and a half, while Jay Gould's income cannot be less than half dozen millions. To come down to smaller men, R. L. Stuart has nearly a million a year, while Robert and Ogden Goelet are each rated at $250,000. Bennett is rated at $600.000. D. O. Mills figures at $300,000, and the young Vanderbilts, William K. and Cornelius, are not much below him. The estate of A. T. Stewart & Co. has an income of a million, which renders Cornelia Stewart the richest widow in America. The Astors, John, Jacob and William, are estimated each at a million and a half, while Wm. H. Vanderbilt probably has five times that sum, and yet, within five minutes walk from the place where these men live, one can find multitudes whose life is but a prolonged battle with famine."

In the New England States we see the small farms being gradually, but surely, united under a few proprietors, and the dispossessed farmers flocking to the towns and cities; with the result of making the rural population almost stationary

in numbers, dissatisfied, and becoming poorer and poorer, and the cities becoming more wicked. Says the *Missouri Republican:*

"Although the State of Connecticut gained 88,633 in population from 1870 to 1880, the gain was wholly confined to the large cities and manufacturing towns, and there has been a falling off in the population of the agricultural districts of 12,684. The agricultural commissioners of the State allude to this in their report as a cause for solicitude. All the farming districts show a decrease in population, and this although the excellence of the soil in some of them, the convenience to market, the demand for all kinds of farm products, and the high prices they command, ought to make farming exceptionally profitable. The farms of the State do not produce enough food to supply the population, and the deficiency has to be made up by bringing in food from the West—a condition one would think very favorable to the Connecticut farmer. Nevertheless, there has been for fifty years a steady drain on the rural population; the inhabitants of the farming districts are becoming less numerous every year—some going to the West and others drifting to the manufacturing towns to engage in mechanical and mercantile pursuits. The commissioners attribute this steady depopulation to the influence which the West exercises upon the young and enterprising, and to the practice of the moneyed institutions of investing a large share of their capital outside the State. Of course the decrease in the farming population must be attended by the same process witnessed in other New England States—the merging of small farms into large ones and their ownership by wealthy persons. It would appear, then, that the old native yeomanry element is disappearing from New England, and the country is falling into the hands of wealthy manufacturers, New York merchants and foreign mill operators."

And we can, with perfect safety, predict the same result for the South and West, as soon as the South and West be-

come a little more thickly populated, or as fast as foreign and Eastern capitalists can buy up the lands, which they are now so rapidly doing.

For, as the *Globe–Democrat* observes, "real estate investment is becoming popular with capitalists, because of the low rate of interest offered by the government." And it may have added, because of the light returns railroads may be expected to yield, in view of the competition amongst them, and of State laws hampering their actions.

And to the same result the New York *World* refers when it says: "A non-resident proprietorship, like that of Ireland, is getting to be the characteristic of large farming districts in New England, adding yearly to the nominal value of leasehold farms, advancing yearly the rent demanded, and steadily degrading the character of the tenantry." And the *Nation*, alluding to the same section of our country, says:

"Increased nominal value of land, higher rents, fewer farms occupied by owners, diminished products, lower wages, a more ignorant population, increasing number of women employed at hard, out-door labor (surest sign of a declining civilization,) and a steady deterioration in the style of farming—these are the conditions described by a cumulative mass of evidence that is perfectly irresistible."—*Progress and Poverty*, *p.* 359.

And if we turn our attention to the West we find in Dakota, California and other Western States, farms on a scale unparalleled for magnitude in the history of the world.[t] Cap-

[t] "The great wheat field of California lies in Colusa county, which also contains one of the largest farms in the world. The county comprises a large part of the extensive Sacramento Valley, and is sixty miles in length and on an average of forty-five in width. It has an area of about 1,800,000 acres, of which a million of acres grow wheat. Of this vast tract 477,000 acres are owned by 129 men. One owns 55,000 acres; one, 24,000; one, 20,000; three, 16,000; one, 15,000; three, 14,000; six, 10,000; one,

ital organized to work them like gold mines, skin them, gut them, and then convert them into stock ranches, or, as one of these large proprietors said to Count Andrassy, sell them to the Germans, *i. e.*, to the small farmers. In other words in a little time these large farms being exhausted by the present method of tillage, will be sold out to small farmers, just as in the South many planters are selling portions of the large plantations to immigrants or negroes. But men now gambling in stocks, in cotton or provisions, or manufacturing sheetings, boots and shoes, or soap, who may desire after awhile to settle down into gentlemanly idleness, will buy up these farmers, who by that time will have become embarrassed, and the process will be repeated in America that followed private ownership of land in all other countries.[u] And if, perchance, one of these retired capitalists builds a pretty house, buys fancy implements, and cultivates turnips and literature together, we will "point with pride" to our American edition of the Lord of the

8,000; two, 7,000; six, 6,000; three, 5,000; eight, 4,000; five, 3,000; eighteen, 2,000; three, 1,500; thirty-six, 1,00, and twenty-nine, 500. The result has been to debar immigration and choke out tradesmen and mechanics. The largest land owner in Colusa county is Dr. H. J. Glen. His farm contains 55,000 acres, and has a river frontage of 16½ miles and is enclosed by 150 miles of fence."—*New York Sun.*

[u]The following facts, contributed by "Gath" to the *Cincinnati Enquirer*, August 28, 1882, will prove interesting as showing what will ultimately be the wages that our farm hands will eventually receive from those who own the lands of America fifty or one hundred years hence; "The wages of farm labor was in Ireland from 20 to 36 cents a day; in Scotland, 60 to 72; Belgium, 17 to 40; France, 28 to 40; Prussia, 27; Silesia, 12 to 20; Austria about 20; Italy, Spain and Portugal about 20. The value of land per acre in Ireland was $150 to $225; Great Britain, $250 to $400; Belgium, $250 to $425; France $200 to $300; Prussia, $200 to $300.

Manor, and call this civilization. And justify the result, if made aware at what great expense it was accomplished, by pratings of the law of the survival of the fittest and the necessity for such a law. And yet further to show what pernicious effects are produced by excluding labor from the soil, and which these large farms are even already causing, the following extract from a correspondent of Ruskin, who writes to that gentleman from California, will be appropriate and interesting. And we who know that the evil increases in proportion to the growing population of the country, and who know that the state of affairs remarked by this correspondent really exists as he describes it, can appreciate the sarcasm, not to say the rancor, that tinges the utterances of Ruskin, when it is necessary to refer for the purpose of comparison with England to the condition of the poor and the laboring classes in the United States. Says the correspondent referred to:

"We have a genial climate and a productive soil; our farms (ranches) frequently embrace many thousands of acres, while the rule is scarcely ever less than hundreds of acres. Wheat fields of 5,000 acres are by no means uncommon, and not a few of above 40,000 acres are known. To cultivate these extensive tracts much machinery is used, such as steam plows, gauge-plows, reaping, mowing, sowing and threshing machines, and seemingly to the utter extermination of the spirit of home and rural life. Gangs of laborers are hired during the emergency of harvesting, and they are left, for the most part, unhoused, and are also fed more like animals than men. Harvesting over they are discharged, and thus are left, near the beginning of our long and rainy winters, to shift for themselves. Consequently, the larger towns and cities are infested for months with idle men and boys. House-breaking and highway robbery are of almost daily occurrence. As to the farmers themselves,

they live in a dreary, comfortless way, and are mostly without education or refinement."[v]

And while these large farms are being worn out and sold to small farmers, cities will have greatly increased in population and wealth, and speculators and manufacturers, will have obtained riches by the toil of the poor, and will ultimately buy out these small farmers, or take their farms for debt, and these farmers will have to leave all the associations of childhood, and seek in new sections, if possible, new homes; or will have to go to work on these farms for these "new gentry," or will become reckless and take to crime or despondent and despairing and will take to drink. And thus crimes will multiply, and men will legislate against the use of whisky, will multiply laws and penitentiaries. And Christians, no more able to see the real cause, and no more willing by right methods to remedy it than non-Christians, will point to the wickedness of the nature of man as self-demonstrated, and will make appeals for money to enable them to distribute "a few millions more" of Bibles and tracts. While the successful scrambler, now subsided into a retired city bond holder, or real estate owner, or country squire, will deliver oracular opinions on the turbulence of "our lower classes" and their unreasonableness, and will point to himself as illustrating the beauty of a system that *could produce such a brilliant result.*

While our cities, like Boston, will represent more capital than a State like Missouri:

"The Boston city assessors have completed the work of assessing the property of that city for taxation for the present year and made a report that is very gratifying. The real property is valued at $455,383,000 and the personal at $210,-

[v] *Letters to Workingmen and Laborers.*

130,000—total $665,513,000. This is greater than the valuation of the whole state of Missouri, St. Louis included. There is a gain of $18,013,500 in the realty valuation over 1880, and of $8,037,000 in the personalty—making a total gain of $26,051,00."—*Missouri Republican.*"

"Look on that picture and then on this:

"Boston and the Working Women.—A Pitiable Picture—Extract from the last Report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor Statistics.

"In Boston a large proportion are workers in shops. We will take one trade, that of tailoresses and cloak-makers; they go to their work at seven almost always without any warm breakfast; they work till ten and then perhaps have a few minutes' rest, when a little teapot is set on the range and a lunch of dry food eaten; but in most of the establishments the girls do not stop work till twelve, when, in all, they are allowed from thirty to sixty minutes for dinner. Work ends at 5 P. M., and many of the girls take work home with them, work not ceasing till midnight.

"Room-rent cost not less than two dollars to three dollars each, with often two or more double beds in a room. In good shops, and with brisk work, they can earn a dollar a day. Some machine girls receive more, but the work is very wearying, and induces spinal disease—one of our largest as well as kindest custom-work merchant tailors testified to a committee of inquiry, that few 'machine girls' could work over two years before becoming so broken down that they were ever after unfit for labor. In slop work shops girls can seldom earn more than their room rent—except by overwork. In slack times their sufferings are extreme, girls having been known to work for weeks with only water and bread or crackers for food, and fortunate if able to procure an ounce of tea. In dull times many have lived for weeks on five cents' worth each of stale bread per week while seeking work. The lodging-house keepers charge working women higher rates than men, and many refuse to have them in their houses at any price. Hence they are often obliged to live and sleep in localities, where they would be ashamed to let any one know they ever went. Yet few ever break down morally or become untidy in dress. Those women who take work home from the slop shops, Provident, Aid, and other charitable societies receive as follows: Shirts, 4 cents to 7 cents; fine bosomed shirts, 10 cents to 25 cents; satin vests, 20 cents; pants, 15 cents, 20 cents, and 37 cents; coats, 50 cents; French calico suits, lined sacks, faced skirt, 20 cents; long, white night-dresses, 50 cents. Of the thirty thousand women in and about Boston who live by sewing, very few earn

And New York City will represent more wealth than perhaps half the Union. And in the streets of these cities, little boys and girls, who should be receiving a mother's or a father's care, will be selling papers or begging for a living, and fitting themselves to become criminals and outcasts when a little older.

Older girls and young women who[x] should, under happier

over $12 a week; the average wages do not exceed $2.75. Many poor women take this slop and charity work in quantities. and give it to others to do, still further lessening the receipts of the actual workers, who are usually women with small families dependent upon their labor for support. Paper-box makers average about $3 per per week.

"Factory life is much harder on women than it was twenty-five years ago. Instead of tending two looms, as then, she is required to tend six; while a week's work now will not procure as much comfort as when she tended only one loom. Very few working women of any class ever have a good bed with sufficient bed-covering.

Their wages will not allow them to purchase warm flannel under-garments or serviceable shoes, water-proofs, etc. Few are ever exempt from diseases caused by scanty clothing, insufficient and innutritious food, and long continued labor in deleterious conditions. The constant pressure of anxiety breaks down many girls physically, and too often morally, before they reach the prime of life. All avenues of employment are overcrowded."—*De Cassagnac's History of the Working and Burgher Classes—Ben. E. Green's Translation—Translator's Preface.*

[x] "What is called the 'sweating' system is increasing (in England) in every direction, with the result that young women actually work fourteen hours a day, for six days in the week, for a dollar a week, out of which they have to find house-rent and food: several cases of this awful slavery have lately figured in the police courts * * Lastly, the increase of prostitution, especially of very young women and children, of late years is alone enough to show the utter rottenness of our society."—*H. M. Hyndman in The North American Review, Oct.*, 1882.

And that to this we in the United States are steadily gravitating, is proven by the fact that even now in our oldest and wealthiest and larger cities the same results are the consequences of our civilization—i. e., just as our civilization is being perfected by age these terrible results follow.

auspices, have been the light of homes of their own, the loved of father or brother or husband, make their appointments and assignations by the glare of our beautiful electric lights and the illumination of our magnificent shops. Aged and broken down, hapless and unhappy men will be seen struggling, shambling, along at some dirty or toilsome drudgery. Venerable women, if age and sorrow could make venerable these poor, lonely creatures, will be offering apples or oranges, day after day, in the glare of a summer sun, or in the hail and sleet of winter's cold; or picking rags or garbage to eke out their miserable existences. But our palace cars will be superb in their varnish and gold. And our conductors *do* look so military and stylish in their uniforms and brass buttons; and our mansions rival for splendor, and our stables, in many instances, surpass anything that imperial Rome in her "palmiest" days could show. And these mansions are not the less splendid because they are as likely to be assignation houses as the homes of our "representative citizens." In the meanwhile, too, our Sunday schools will keep on taking up nickel collections for the poor heathens who, in nine cases out of ten, are in every respect better off than the poor of our larger cities. Y. M. C. A. young men will go to sing the "Sweet Bye-and-Bye' to convicts and miserables in the work-houses and penitentiaries, and tell them beautiful baby stories of Heaven. And our preachers will still go on refining and modifying and explaining passages of Scripture to suit a posterior conclusion, and with seraphic smiles will congratulate their congregations that " we are so fortunate as to live in a land of Bibles and Sunday-schools," or in delivering sermons descriptive of how lovely every thing would be if we *only would be good*—as good as they are, for instance. And all this, too, we call civilization.

We have, by this casual and short review of a few of the symptoms that follow upon private ownership of land, seen what mischief has already been caused to our own country from this evil. And, observing that these results are increasing year after year, the reader can judge for himself of the answer to be given to our query, which was: That admitting the principle of land ownership to be wrong and to have caused the miseries of Ireland and England, if we, in the United States, have any reason to fear from the same cause?

On the other hand, in looking to see how much land is still free, we find our "boundless domain" fast falling into the hands of private parties, railroads and other joint stock companies. There are three stages through which land passes, in the history of all countries that recognize the right of ownership of soil. First, large estates obtained by fraud, force, chicanery, charter, by discovery, or by purchase. From causes too numerous to particularize in detail they become divided, more or less, and fall into the hands of small proprietors. This is the second stage. These small proprietors become embarrassed, sell out or are sold out, and from many causes all operating to the same end, the broad acres again lapse into the hands of the wealthy few, too often into the hands of those who, as merchants or speculators, were the helpless or reckless cause of the ruin of the small proprietors. This is third and the last, then comes revolution.[y]

[y] "According to the United States census report the number of farms in the United States in 1880 was 4,008,867. Of these 2,984,306 were occupied by the owners; 322,357 were rented at fixed money rental; 102,244 were rented for shares of the products; 4,352 farms were less than three acres; 134,889 above three acres and less than ten; 254, 749 between ten

Thomas Donaldson, writing in the *North American Review*, August, '81, says:

"The public domain of the United States, acquired by cession from the several States and by treaty from France, Spain and Mexico, Texas and Russia amounts, to 2,894,235.91 square miles, or about 1,852,310,000 acres, and its cost was, in round number, $322,000,000, of which sum the government has received back about $200,000,000, for lands sold. Down to July, 1880, the Government of the United States had disposed, by sale, of about 170,000,000; by act of donation 3,000,000 acres; in bounties for military and naval services, 61,000,000 acres; for internal improvement, 7,000,000 acres; by grants of saline lands to States, 560,000 acres; for town sites and county seats, 150,000 acres; by patent to railway companies, 45,000,000; canal grants, 4,000,000; for military roads, 1,300,000; by sale of mineral lands (since 1866), 148,000; homesteads, 55,000,000; scrip, 2,900,000; coal lands, 10,750; stone and timber lands (Act of 1878), 21,000; swamp and overflowed lands, given to States, 69,000,000; for educational purposes, 78,000,000; under timber culture act, 9,350,000; graduation act of 1854, 25,000,000."

Of all the lands remaining to the government, he says, "purely agricultural lands, except in the five Southern States, have practically ceased to be. The amount of these lands are estimated to be 25,000,000, which are open to private entry at $1.25 per acre in unlimited quantities. For such has been the ignorant liberality of our government,

and twenty acres; 781,474 between twenty and fifty; 1,032,910 between fifty and one hundred; 1,695,933 between 100 and 500; 75,972 between and 1,000, and 23,578 were 1,000 acres in extent and upwards." The above figures are suggestive of the discrepancy existing even in those farms occupied by their owners. When the Department tells us how many of these farms are under mortgage for purchase money, for advances to raise crops and for other causes, the above method of conveying information will be of some value in estimating the prosperity of the country by counting the farms.

and such is the diversity of our State laws, that while in theory the unit of holdings or maximum of allowance is 160 acres for a settler, that one settler can take from the public domain 1,120 acres, viz: under the homestead act, 130; under the desert land act, 640 acres; under the timber culture act, 160 acres; owing to wholesale slaughter of our best agricultural lands it has now become the property of private individuals."

Not only then, like England are we becoming, but, as intimated before, we are becoming as Rome was. In order to show the striking likeness which our government and our morality is fast assuming to the government, the methods and the morality of Rome, during the later days of the Republic, we will transcribe from Froude's *Cæsar* so much as appears pertinent to the subject we are treating, and which will reveal to us that we are fast assuming the condition that in Rome preceded and necessitated the Empire.

"With such vividness, with such transparent clearness does the age stand before us of Cato and Pompey, of Cicero and Julius Cæsar, the more distinctly because it was an age in so many ways the counterpart of our own. The blossoming period of the old civilization, when the intellect was trained to the highest point which it could reach, and on the great subjects of human interest, on morals, on politics, on poetry and art, even on religion itself, and the speculative problems of life. Men thought as we think, doubted as we doubt, argued as we argue, aspired and struggled after the same objects. It was an age of material progress and material civilization; an age of civil liberty and intellectual culture; an age of pamphlets and epigrams, of saloons and of dinner parties, of senatorial majorities and electoral corruption. The highest offices of State were open, in theory, to the meanest citizen, they were confined in fact to those who had the longest purse or the most ready use of the tongue, or popular platforms. Distinctions of birth had been exchanged

for distinctions of wealth. The struggles between plebeians and patricians for equality of privileges were over, and a new division had been formed between the party of property, and a party who desired a change in the structure of society.

The free cultivators were disappearing from the soil. Italy was being absorbed into vast estates, held by a few favored families, and cultivated by slaves, while the old agricultutural population was driven off the lands, and was crowded into towns. The rich were extravagant, for life had ceased to have any practical interest except for its material pleasures.

The occupation of the higher classes was to obtain money without labor, and to spend it in idle enjoyment. Patriotism survived on the lips, but patriotism meant the ascendency of the party which would maintain the existing order of things, or would overthrow it for a more equal distribution of the good things which alone were valued.[1] Religion, once the foundation of the laws and rule of personal conduct, had subsided into opinion. The educated, in their hearts, disbelieved it. Temples were still built with increasing splendor, the established forms were scrupulously observed. Public men spoke conventionally of Providence, that they might throw on their opponents the odium of impiety, but of genuine belief that life had any serious meaning, there was none remaining beyond the circle of the silent, patient, ignorant multitude. The whole spiritual atmosphere was saturated with cant—cant moral, cant political, cant religious, an affectation of high principles, which had ceased to touch the conduct, and flowed on in an

[1] And reflective minds, knowing the methods often adopted by our political chiefs to secure a party triumph in doubtful States, may find food for thought in the following from Montesquieu's *Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans:* "Ambitious men caused the populations of entire cities and nations to congregate at Rome for the purpose of corrupting the suffrage, or of obtaining their vote for themselves."—*p.* 184—*Baker's Translation.*

increasing volume of intensity and unreal speech. The truest thinkers were those who, like Lucretius, spoke frankly out their convictions, declared that Providence was a dream, and that man and the world he lived in were material phenomena, generated by natural forces out of cosmic atoms, and into atoms to be again resolved."—*Cæsar—A Sketch.*

In a word, the Republic was on the highroad to ruin. Tiberius Gracchus years before, "while still at an age when indignation at oppression called out a practical desire to resist it," saw the cause of the growing luxury, licentiousness, and poverty of the times, and endeavored to check it. In Tuscany he saw the large estate system in full operation, the fields cultivated by slave gangs, the free citizens of the Republic thrust away into the towns, aliens and outcasts in their own country, without a foot of soil which they could call their own. He espoused the cause of the people and obtained his agrarian laws, but in the end was killed by the land-holding patricians and their mobs. Caius Gracchus revived the laws ten years after the murder of his brother, and settled forty thousand peasant proprietors on the public lands, but he, too, was murdered. Sylla divided the estates of the liberal gentry and magistrates into 120,000 allotments among his friends and soldiers, and slaves that he had freed, and thus the small proprietors were artificially established.

But the statesmanship or the tyranny that secured this result was alike ineffectual to produce permanent reform in this particular, in face of the strong tendencies in an opposite direction, that was produced by the right of individuals to own land, which was the legitimate result where private ownership of land is a recognized right. In a short time the small peasants fell into debt, Sylla's soldiers were expensive and became embarrassed, and thus the small properties were falling again into the market. The great

land-owners bought them up and Italy was once more lapsing to territorial magnates, cultivating their estates by slaves. And by the operations of this system of political economy, founded upon the right of individuals to ownership of the soil, the wealth of the land-owners continually increased, or was dissipated in useless and extravagant display; and the poverty of the people became more and more abject, until Rome became the hot-bed of all wickedness. Which result will always occur when, by the operations of laws, the people are divided into the very rich and the very poor, and a struggling and ever-diminishing middle class.

And now that we have not only proved our proposition, but have illustrated it, that proposition may be considered as established. But not so, or not entirely so, by all. Many will find loop-holes to escape from the conclusions of our logic. And to the consideration of one of these probable objections it is well to give some attention. It may be said that there was an element of destruction existing in Roman society which does not exist to canker and destroy the civilizations of modern Europe and America. It is true that legal slavery is no longer an institution in any civilized country, though many freedmen have had, and many still have, good cause to regret a philanthropy as unphilosophic and indiscriminate as it was costly. But what the Roman landlord accomplished by slave labor—the exclusion of the peasantry from the soil—we are enabled to do, and are now doing, by means of machinery.[aa]

And while the result in creating paupers and other unfortunates is the same in both cases, modern civilization is the

[aa] "Indeed the greater exclusion of people from the land by machinery in the North, is cited by some writers as an evidence of the superiority of the North over the South."—*See article in Scribner, January*, 1878.

more heartless; because the moderns think that pauperism is inevitable, and arises because of sound politico-economic laws; and, more unfair than that of Rome, makes no adequate provisions for their poor to be supplied with the necessities of life, except in the cases of the infirm and aged, and this in the form of a charity as precarious, ofttimes, as it is insufficient always. And which, being given *as a charity*, is as debasing to the recipient as it is most frequently demoralizing to honest industry; while by machinery the fortunate land owner gains a cheaper and a safer instrument of his will than the Romans possessed in their slaves.[bb]

The 55,000 acres of Dr. Glenn, of California, can be more economically cultivated, and with less danger by a few men and modern machinery, than would have been necessitated by the hire of slaves, or the purchase of intelligent slaves to superintend the slave labor, on a Roman farm of the same size 2,000 years ago. In both instances free labor is crowded out of employment, and land that could sustain in comfort and plenty at least 1,000 families, is monopolized to the use of one man, and who, if he be a vicious or profligate person, will use the wealth so acquired in ostentatious display, or in reckless but glittering speculations that may corrupt the morals and demoralize the industrious habits of possibly a thousand more.

But again, it may be said we have nothing to fear—we are too highly educated. Greece reached in two hundred and fifty years the highest intellectual development the world has ever known, and yet Greece has fallen from her greatness, and the children of Greece are not even good caricatures of their fathers.

[bb]"The Romans regarded their slaves as actual enemies, hardly less than the Goths or Carthagenians."—*Merivale's Rome, p.* 220.

But we are a free people and have a popular form of government. "The Roman constitution," says Froude, "was popular in form beyond all constitutions of which there is any record in history." "Rome," says Heinrich Zschokke, in his History of Switzerland, "was the most powerful city in the whole world. She had become such through the liberty, the heroism, and the wisdom of her citizens. Yet Rome fell because of her own rottenness."

But we are religious, and "in God is our trust."

Constantinople was founded by the first Christian Emperor, and was confessedly the City of Christ, yet the Crescent for four hundred years or more has waived triumphantly over the mosque of St. Sophia. Egypt was the mother of religion; and the Saracens hundreds of years ago anticipated our recognition of the Deity by inscriptions on coins.[cc]

But it may be said, finally, that we are scientific. How can the analysis or decomposition of a fluid, or the dissection of a body, or torturing of a dog, or the making of a discovery in astronomy, in the compounding of medicine, in the manufacture of tools and machinery, the invention of pills or plasters, make us nobler or better, or as a nation longer lived[dd] than those nations we have named, many of

[cc] *Gibbon, Vol. IV., p.* 495.

[dd] The hopeful conclusion arrived at by Baker on the chances for longer duration of modern over the average existence of ancient nations is doubtless correct, when indulged in with reference to such nations as have been able to restrict the political power to the educated classes. But in the cases of such nations as the United States, where the suffrage is in the hands of the ignorant and poor, it can be readily seen that, on the contrary, the probable duration of the life of such nation will be very much shorter than any of the prominent civilizations which he, following Quetelet, has instanced.—See p. 411 of his translation of *Montesquieu's Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans.*

whom counted many hundred years as their life time, if we, at the end of our first centennial, are already exhibiting such ominous signs of decay? Far from helping us, we will find when the hour comes that science will arm *our* barbarians with their deadliest weapons. Not only, therefore, are we approximating in our social condition the distress of England and Ireland, but we very much resemble in our manners and methods, our constitution and our corruption, our irreligion and our blindness, the condition of Rome during the last days of the Republic. Yet, in spite of all, in the face of all our troubles, our growing poverty and increasing wickedness, in the face of our ever-growing monopolies and increasing extravagances, our daily press continues to herald at every opportunity such misleading nonsense as this we copy from a daily paper:

BUSINESS!

A Year of Unexampled Prosperity Just Passed—"*Interesting Comparative Figures for the Years* 1880–1881."

Then follows a long list of figures, showing the amount of business done in New York, Boston, Chicago, St. Louis, and other cities. All having as much relation to the real prosperity of the people as the rent-rolls of the 3,700 persons who own 15,600,000 acres of Ireland has to the prosperity of the people of Ireland.

The fact of the matter is, that our daily press in its efforts to sum up or give a clear statement of the condition of the country, acts in the same superficial manner that our older historians did in describing the condition of England or France. Nothing was said of the people, but all their attention was confined to the description of battles and sieges, of castles and villas, and to delineations of tournaments and processions, of courts and receptions, of kings and queens.

How many acres constituted the park of this gracious Duke; how many the estate of that noble Earl; what the rent-roll of the Count of Acrefield; how many men-at-arms followed the standard of the Baron of Pumpkinville to the siege of Squashtown. The press places our merchant princes, our railroad kings, our mammoth corporations, our successful Buchu swindlers and fortunate liver-pad and liver-pill founders of princely houses, on the same pinnacle of greatness, and, observing these, deduce the same conclusions that a stranger present at Versailles during the reign of Louis XIV would have made regarding the condition of the peasantry of France: if such is the condition of the representatives, surely that of the people is also good in proportion. Forgetting, as did their predecessors, the historians before alluded to, that it is not the minarets or domes or spires of churches, or mosques, or palaces, or festivals, that indicate the prosperity of a country, but the number and the condition of the homes of the people. And as the wealth and extravagance of nobles and kings and churches was in an inverse ratio to the wealth and comforts of the laboring classes of old, so it is even now. And this lesson we will do well to heed, that when that poverty fell too heavily on the people, the bluest blooded Earl and the proudest Duke of them all fell before the wrath of the people like pines before the storm.

To quote from Zschokke's History of Switzerland, (Shaw's translation): "When the despotism, selfishness, injustice and pride of the ruling seignors had reached their height, then the poor people in Reutia remembered that they also were men, and moreover, that God had given to them, as his children, rights which no tyrant should violate." And all the pomp and pride, glitter and gold, that so short a time

before seemed so secure, so solidly established, and so essential to the maintenance of the dignity and stability of society, were swept away, as by a torrent from the mountains, and were gladly forgotten by a world that will always manage to create circles and societies with sufficient of merit and show to make them oblivious of the self-supposed important institutions and customs of the past.

And while the press is almost universally confining its attention to such statements, and to the bickerings of party leaders, or to descriptions of society events, to the comparisons of the amount of dollars this millionaire has more than another, to glowing accounts of prize fights, minute details of races and walking matches, our troubles constantly increase. Yet the gentlemen who edit our principal papers are, as a class, the most intelligent and best posted men in our midst; yet when they devote an editorial to the conditions of the times, what light does it give for us to walk by? We copy a late editorial that will illustrate the inability of the press to give us any practical counsel whereby we may avert the troubles that threaten us:

"'The Chicago *Tribune* has a panicky article about the fact made known to the country by Mr. Jay Gould's recent display of stock, that he is worth not far from one hundred millions of dollars. We quote: 'So far there has been no government interference to head off or regulate this natural culmination of concentrated wealth. Shall there be any in the future? With every year and every day the giants of monopoly are accumulating still vaster wealth with which to stamp out opposition, stifle criticism, and buy up legislators. The power of resistance by lawful and peaceful means is constantly diminishing by delay. If it comes to the worst—if despotism shall grow up in this country under the accumulation of wealth instead of the divine right of Kings—there will be only one remedy. Revolution is

the only refuge against oppression, whatever form it may take or whatever origin it may have had.'

"This is not an utterance remarkable for wisdom. We had better have a few great fortunes, built up by superior skill in handling large affairs, than to have the clumsy hands of the blundering government meddling and muddling. The only way to reform the government is to cut down its work and its expenses. We would far rather trust the railroad, and telegraph, and express interests, where they are now, than in the hands of Congress. It ill becomes the people of the United States to distrust combinations of individual adventure and calculation, or to talk of revolution because a few immense fortunes have been accumulated by persons whose remarkable qualities have enabled them to take advantage of the wonderful fields for enterprise in this country, which is destined soon to be the richest in the world."—*Cincinnati Commercial.*

"The Probable Democratic Policy.—If the Democratic party can be said to be shaping anything like a definite policy with reference to the fall elections and those of the next Presidential year, it is against the conservative property interests. It has long been the characteristic disposition of that party to seize upon positions that address themselves to the less intelligent classes of the people. This may be a necessity rather than a choice, for the reason that the Republican party having, in general, a better appreciation of the principles of political economy, occupy the better stand point and leave only the inferior to the opposition. It is the boast of the Democratic leaders that they represent the interests of the great masses of the people, especially those of the laboring classes; and they, by constant inference, if not by direct assertion, preach the pernicious doctrine that there is a necessary conflict between capital and labor.

"They purposely or ignorantly disregard the fact that good wages and steady employment depend upon the conservation of capital, and that capital, to be productive, must

be used in a way that is beneficial to all, etc. That there are temporary abuses of power by corporations is true, but to attack the moneyed interests as a whole on this account is equally as silly as to cut off one's arm on account of a sore finger. There must be accumulations of capital, and they must be protected, or there would be no great enterprises that redound to the benefit of all mankind started and pushed to a successful issue. No one will invest money in railroads or banks if their property is not rendered secure, neither on any other basis will large manufacturing establishments be founded and carried on, giving employment to the working classes and cheapening the general cost of living. For the poorer classes to strike at capital in its legitimate forms, in any way, is simply the performance on their part of a suicidal act, etc.

"But the Democratic leaders do not go to the trouble of explaining the true philosophy of the relations between capital and labor. Most of them probably do not comprehend them. But that some do, and consciously stoop to demagogism, goes without saying. They consider the issue 'a good enough Morgan' for them, and are unprincipled enough to make use of it if they see any chance of it riding into power on it. They practically say to those whose votes they want: 'This man is rich and you are poor. That man is a banker and you are a laborer. There is something wrong here. You are being robbed.' They say to the debtor class: 'It is for your interest to have cheap money. The lowering of the standard will make it more easy for you to pay your debts. The banker and creditor want stability to make themselves richer and you poorer.' This is very persuasive and plausible talk to pour into the ears of the poor and ignorant man, and it is not without its effect even on the intelligent debtor class, though at the cost of individual honesty. If any one tells the unthinking voters that there are certain principles of safe finance which are as true and fixed as the law of gravitation, and that a feeling of insecurity engendered among capitalists, the changing of the standard of value, and loose legislation affecting

money, will derange business and the industries generally, stopping looms and closing foundries, he will be met with the charge of being the paid instrument of the money power or personally interested himself in grinding the poor.

"The wickedness of inaugurating a war of this kind for the mere sake of a political issue must be apparent to any one who is enabled to give the matter intelligent thought. There is only one excuse for those who engage in it, and that is ignorance. Beyond doubt there are monopolies of certain kinds that should be placed under legislative restraint. The question as to how to deal properly with these is a legitimate one. It is a difficult one as well. It is these that give those who want to make political capital out of attacking corporations a dangerous argument. They assail an essential principle of prosperity for the reason that many minds are unable to separate it from an abuse. It requires a certain amount of intelligence to see where the line between the two is. The old argument which has led to so many disastrous results, *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, is brought into requisition, and as a consequence we have men who ought to know better, and some who do know better, howling against railroads, banks and sound money, as if they were the greatest evils a kind Providence ever showered down upon afflicted mankind—just as if railroads, banks and sound money were not as necessary to the life of modern commerce and industries as bread and meat to the individual. When hard times come the outcry is especially dangerous. Those who recall what a narrow escape our late resumption of specie payment had, and the incongruous state of our currency as it is, recognized the gravity of such a situation.

"It is, of course, claimed that it is not intended to abolish banks or railroads or sound money. But it is intended to treat banks and railroads so that careful men would have nothing to do with them, and would take their money out as soon as possible, while, so far as tampering with the money itself is concerned, it has never been found conducive to business to keep altering pint measures and yardsticks. But the indications are that the Democratic party

are about to make all they can out of sham theories and financial demagogism. They will raise the cry of antimonopoly until they disgust those who are trying to solve the real problem of obviating the abuses that may exist. They have already begun their senseless assault on the national banks. They will generally sustain the cause of the 87-cent dollar and the scaling of debts involved. The contest, in the nature of things, will begin before this session of Congress is over."—*St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Feb.* 25, '82.

Now all this reasoning in a circle which characterizes the editorials quoted above, and the opinions and advice of the press generally, arise simply from an acceptation without sufficient examination of the major premises of the argument of the political economist, the right of individual property in land, or, as they prefer to formulate the dogma in England, that "the price of labor is necessarily and of right regulated by the income of the gentlemen of England." Accepting this major premise, and seeing that the minor premise, which is understood to be industry, and economy, does not produce the predicted result, viz: Prosperity, they endeavor by casuistical and subtle arguments to show either that the second premise is wanting, or lacks some element (such as protection or free trade, want of factories, or too many factories) which, if present or absent, would allow industry and economy to produce their perfect work.

In a word, they ring the multitudinous changes of reform altogether on the second, the minor proposition, never once attacking the major, the acceptance of which necessarily creates this shifting, and evasive and circuitous manner of dealing with the subject. And be the intentions of the gentlemen of the press however good, be their purpose however earnest to promote justice and foster righteousness, unless they go to the root of the evil, purposes and intentions

will continue forever in vain. And to get at the root of this evil, we must discover how this land became subject to private ownership in Europe, and determine if the methods by which this result was accomplished were in accord with the abstract principles of right and justice. If yes, then this major premise, so long assumed as undeniable, may remain as it has so long remained, the bed-rock upon which modern European and American political economy is founded; if not, then we will see the uselessness of attempting to build on a foundation of injustice a civilization that can ever attain a happy culmination.

When the Roman Empire was conquered by the barbarians of the North, these wild and warlike hordes found that their first efforts should be to so strengthen themselves in their new possessions as to secure them from foreign invasions or domestic revolutions, consequently

"Instead of those loose associations, which, though they scarcely diminished their personal independence, had been sufficient for their security while they remained in their original countries, they saw the necessity of confederating more closely together, and of relinquishing some of their private rights in order to attain public safety. Every freeman," therefore, "upon receiving a portion of the lands which were divided, bound himself to appear in arms against the enemies of the community." Later, "the powerful vassals of the crown soon *extorted* a confirmation for life of those grants of land, which, being at first purely gratuitous, had been bestowed only during pleasure. Not satisfied with this, they *prevailed to have them converted into hereditary* possessions. One step more completed their *usurpations* and rendered them unalienable."[ee]

In this extract from the historian we have the origin of hereditary possession of land in modern Europe.

[ee] Robertson's *History of the Middle Ages*, page 9.

Force, fraud and usurpation constitute the foundation upon which this right exists, and unless this wrong to the people is remedied, vain will be all our endeavors to produce, from such a foundation, a civilization that will be conducive to the happiness of the people.

The fathers of our Republic, thinking that the evil results of European civilization were due, in great measure, to the unalienability of the large estates of England, provided against evil from this source affecting the nation they founded, by the abolition of the law of primogeniture.

But that this measure was but a temporary palliative, and could not effect a cure of the diseases that followed upon the right to own land, time has abundantly proven. It remains for us, their descendants, to profit by the lessons a more complete experience inculcates, and to follow their example of abolishing the law of primogeniture by the abrogation of the right of purchase and sale.

To effect a reformation that will admit of good results in the future, we must make it impossible for any individual to buy or sell any portion of that spontaneous gift of nature, which is the common property of all her children. Of all "the relics of barbarism," this has produced most mischief, and should be quickly relegated to the limbo of the past.

As long as upon this basis we attempt to happily build society, just so long will we find ourselves involved in an inextricable confusion of make-shifts and palliatives; just so long will our "science" of political economy continue contradicting and confusing in details and pernicious in result.

Up to the time of the adoption of the theories of Adam Smith, England was "protective" in her methods, and yet because of the evils that necessarily followed upon her land

laws, poverty was the lot of the majority of the people of England. She then adopted a free-trade policy, and still, because of the same reason, after a hundred years of trial, and enormous industry, the condition of England is becoming worse and worse, and daily more critical, and now there is a large party in England who advocate a return to "protection" as a remedy for the evils of the present.

We in the United States, after having tried "protection" for many years, are clamoring to be made a free trading nation, oblivious of the fact that what we are agitating to obtain England has had for a hundred years, and which she is now endeavoring to remodel in part, or to entirely change.

Thus, with our eyes closed to the real lessons of history, we continue to grope in the dark, trying expedient after expedient, with always the same disastrous results.

And what are the Churches doing? What steps do they propose in view of existing evils? What has Church and clergy ever done in this matter other than to acquiesce in the established order of affairs?[ff] What except to solicit alms to raise mortgages off Church property, or to be injudiciously given to those who, if society were organized aright, should have the power to support themselves, and contribute their share to the wealth and prosperity of the country? What but soliciting subscriptions for the heathen, while vice and misery are rampant in our own land? What except to preach solemn sermons Sunday after Sunday on such excessively practical and original themes as "Santification," "Justification by Faith," and the "Witness of the Spirit," or some such like important subjects.

And our politicians, what are they doing to check our headlong progress towards yet greater poverty and perhaps

[ff] *See Factors of Civilization, Vol. I., Chap. VII.*

speedy desolation? Quarreling over spoils of office, voting away millions of the people's money in the shape of pensions to soldiers, half of whom were bribed heavily to become soldiers in the first place. And these vast sums now to be given them to find their way into the pockets of agents, pettifogging attorneys and the dram-shops, or variety shows, or fancy women. What but banded together in adverse factions of Democrats and Republicans, paying vast attention to post-office appointments, and standing on their dignity, like children, over trifles, voting away the people's land and money; and by their follies making "confusion worse confounded?' 'Many of them are only qualified to deal with questions that require no thought to suggest, and which are of no importance when settled.

But truly, our politicians and editors are not to be blamed. They fancy, it is true, that they are the guiders and directors of the people, but let one of them take a position, novel by its peculiarity, or peculiar from its novelty, and how quickly they find themselves the targets not only of the country at large, but of their own constituents or subscribers in particular. How many years was it after Adam Smith promulgated his theory of political ecomomy before any politician dared to champion its adoption, even if he had comprehended the reasonings through which Smith reached his conclusions? There is an excuse for editors and Congressmen, they are in the main, but the creations of their times, and their positions are positions occupied primarily to make money, to support themselves and families, or to represent the antagonizing interests of cities and counties, or parties. After that, and confessedly subservient to that, comes the general public interest.

But for our preachers this excuse has no place; set apart,

as they claim to be for the service of God, and the elevation of humanity, all problems that bear upon this subject should claim and secure their first, their persistent attention. Worldly prudence,or financial calculation is supposed not to influence the direction of their teachings.

If we desire to impress on the mind of youth the pernicious results that will follow indulgence in strong drink, we do not direct their attention to the portly, senatorial looking gentleman of good fortune, and happy surroundings, who takes his toddy or his wine with the impunity with which he indulges in his coffee or tea. Nor to him who, for policy or effect, may be seen occasionally a little the worse for his indulgence. But if we wish to impress any lesson upon his mind, convey any warning to his soul, we refer him to the condition of the habitual drunkard, we point his affrighted gaze to the disgusting spectacle of some blear-eyed sot, lolling in swinish stolidity, or idiotic hilarity in the chair or on the floor of some dram-shop, or in the cell of some station-house or prison. So, too, in weighing the consideration which we should give to this matter of private ownership of land, we should study the condition of those countries that have suffered most severely the miseries arising from this cause. In Ireland we see the most striking living example of the effect of this evil. But, unfortunately, Ireland is *so* miserable, that, like the young tippler gazing on the drunkard in the ditch, we cannot realize that so slight a cause, so pleasant a cause in many respects, could ever reduce *us* to such an extremity.

We forget the longer time that this cause has been operating in Ireland, and we forget that our history is so much more recent; we forget the immense advantage we have had over England and Ireland in our greater number of acres;

we forget how our manufactories have helped to postpone the evil day—and though we cannot close our eyes to the results that have so lately begun to thrust themselves upon our attention, *because* we have not yet been reduced to extremity we hope we never will be, and vaguely rely on some mysterious power to be developed from and out of society to meet the constantly increasing evil. Like a man dying with consumption, we are apt never to believe our danger is imminent, until the very last hour has come. But, that all the symptoms indicate that this, our great, over-grown boy of a country is even now threatened with the consumption of nations, no one will deny who is qualified to pass an opinion.

In the earlier age of the world, nations, like men, were often subject to sudden death by violence. And with regard to nations, a day or an hour would often suffice to establish the dominion of one by the destruction of another. But in this age nations are not thus destroyed; they decay in consequence of internal corruption, or in consequence of the operation of causes they cannot remedy, because not discerned. Mexico, Turkey, Spain, some of the South American Republics, are instances in point.

And even England stands ready to fall at the first rude shock from within. The length of life any nation will enjoy will be great in proportion to the ignorance of the people; will be short in proportion to the education or knowledge of the nation. That is, as European nations now exist, for all embrace at least one error in their structure. When all the necessary factors, liberty, education and free lands are united as the basis of a nation's growth, then the life of that nation will be long and splendid in proportion to the knowledge of the people.

It rests with the young of this country of such magnificent promise and capabilities, to say if America shall suffer from the same disease, until it, too, becomes ready for the same fate, or shall be ever troubled with the same wild apprehensions. Rest assured, that because of education there is a new life forming in the bosom of the nation, which, if not recognized and amalgamated by the mother, will eventually deliver itself, and with throes that shall threaten the life of its parent. And, irrespective of the fate of that mother, buoyant with hope and energy, quickened with new ideas and higher aspirations, the young nation, grasping the trailing standard of civilization from the palsied hand of the impotent old, will rush forward to deeds, will climb to heights, that that society which it will succeed could not attempt, and which, because of this very inability it had been doomed to die.

Conceived in corruption, the elect of God shall spring god-like from the bosom of stagnation. For with nations, as with individuals, it is the young who aspire and achieve, the old who calculate and wait; and death is necessary to remove the old, to make room for the young, and it is because of this inability to expand, to glow, to crimson and flush with noble ambition and high endeavor, the Omnipotent has decreed that they must die.

CHAPTER XIII.

A SIMPLE AND EXPEDIENT REMEDY.

"All those who sink down to depraved courses have been impelled to them, either by hunger and cold, or by voluntary laziness. In Canton province thieves and robbers are exceedingly numerous, and they have, no doubt, originated in these causes. In attempting to eradicate their evil practices, the first thing is to provide them with the means of subsistence."—*Chinese Repository, Vol. I, page* 503. *Taken from J. F. Davis' China and the Chinese.*

"The measure itself was admitted to be a moderate one. Every pains had been taken to spare the interests and to avoid hurting the susceptibilities of the aristocrats."—*Cæsar. A Sketch, J. A. Froude.*

That slavery was a moral wrong, abstractly considered, no one will question; but that it was necessarily and absolutely an actual crime, socially and comparatively considered, or embraced injustice and degradation, suffering and misery by mere fact of existence, greater than there would otherwise have been under the same system of political economy, founded on the rights of some to exclude, by priority of possession, others from access to the soil, good and sufficient reasons could be shown to disprove. That advance of primitive man from the custom of slaying his captives to making of them slaves, proves that the mere fact of slavery does not embrace a hardship necessarily and under all circumstances greater than otherwise would have been had they not been reduced to servitude.[a] That many other

[a] "According to the maxims of ancient war, the conqueror became the the lawful master of the enemy he had subdued and spared, and the

evils are greater than slavery is shown by the fact that thousands have voluntarily become slaves from a sense of honor, as among the ancient Germans; and other thousands have offered themselves as slaves to escape the evils of poverty.[b] Says Plutarch, in his life of Lucullus:

"Lucullus was now busy in looking after the cities of Asia, and, having no war to divert his time, spent it in the administration of law and justice, the want of which had for a long time left the province a prey to unspeakable and incredible miseries, so plundered and enslaved by tax farmers and usurers that private people were compelled to sell their sons in the flower of their youth, and their daughters in their virginity, and the States publicly to sell their consecrated gifts, pictures and statues. In the end, their

fruitful cause of personal slavery, which had been almost suppressed by the peaceful sovereignty of Rome, was again revived and multiplied by the perpetual hostilities of the independent barbarians. The majesty of the Roman law protects the liberty of each citizen against the rash effects of his own distress or despair. But the subjects of the Merovingian Kings might alienate their personal freedom, and this act of legal suicide, which was familiarly practiced, is expressed in terms most disgraceful and afflicting to the dignity of human nature.

"The example of the poor, who purchased life by the sacrifice of all that can render life desirable, was gradually imitated by the feeble and devout, who, in times of public disorder, pusillanimously crowded to shelter themselves under the battlements of a powerful chief and around the shrine of a popular saint. Their submission was accepted by these temporal or spiritual patrons, and the hasty transaction irrevocably fixed their own condition and that of their latest posterity."—*Gibbon, Vol. III, pp.* 336-337.

[b] "When their property was exhausted they continued this necessary traffic by the sale of their sons and daughters, and notwithstanding the love of freedom which animated every Gotche breast, they submitted to the humiliating maxim, that it was better for their children to be maintained in a servile condition than to perish in a state of wretched and helpless independence."—*Gibbon, Vol. I, p.* 503.

lot was to yield themselves up slaves to their creditors; but before this, worse trouble befell them; tortures inflicted with ropes and by horses, standing abroad to be scorched when the sun was hot, and being driven into ice and clay in the cold; insomuch that slavery was no less than redemption and joy to them," a custom not confined to Asia, nor to heathens.[c]

That slaves are not all free, and placed in a condition of financial competence, may be a matter of regret, but that this is not their condition should not be a matter of surprise. Let any man who had paid any attention to the physical condition of the slaves of the Southern States, who had remarked their healthy, athletic appearance, who had noted their jovial, humorous and happy deportment, who was at all conversant with their games and recreations, who was aware of the thousand strong attachments that existed between them and their owners—let any one, in a word, who is qualified, by experience or reading, to draw a parallel, compare for a moment the condition of the slaves South, before the war, and the condition of thousands, who, while

[c] "If we may give credit to 'Munster, amongst us Christians, in Lithuania, they voluntarily mancipate and sell themselves, their wives and children to rich men to avoid hunger and beggary. Many make away with themselves in this extremity."—*Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy*, *p.* 172.*

*"Notwithstanding the immense difference between the first of these classes and the third (freemen who were agriculturists, and slaves, subject to sale, to torture and to death at the hands of their masters), such was the spirit of tyranny which prevailed among the great proprietors of land (in England and Europe as late as the 12th century), and so various their opportunities of oppressing those who were settled on their estates, and of rendering their condition intolerable, that many farmers, in despair, renounced their liberty and voluntarily surrendered themselves as slaves to their powerful masters."—*Robertson's History of the Middle Ages*, *p.* 139.

nominally free, were the most wretched of human beings. A hundred instances of the condition of millions of white men, women and children, could be shown to prove that if the option was offered of freedom at the price paid, as the only alternative, any man in his senses would have chosen to have been a slave under conditions as they existed in the South.

De Quincey in his essay on Protestantism referring to the condition of many of the Scotch and English colliers, says:

"These hideous abuses, which worked for generations through the silent aid of dense ignorance in some quarters, and of old traditional maxims in others, under the darkness of general credulity, and riveted, locally by brazen impudence in lawyers, gave way (I believe), not to any express interference of the legislature (for in these monstrous inroads upon human rights the old proverbial saying was exemplified, *out of sight out of mind*, and no Bastile can be so much out of sight as a mine or a colliery), but simply to the *instincts of truth and knowledge slowly diffusing their contagious light* * * * * * * * * Meantime, I am not able to say whether all the evils of female participation in mining labor, as contemplated by the wisdom of Parliament, so fearfully disturbing the system of their natural houshold functions, and lowering so painfully the dignity of their sexual position, have even yet been purified. Mr. Bald, a Scottish engineer chiefly applying his science to collieries, describes a state of degradation, as pressing upon the female co-operations in the system of some collieries, which is likely enough to prevail at this hour (February, 1858), insomuch as the substitution of male labor would often prove too costly, besides that the special difficulty of the case would thus be aggravated. I speak of cases where the avenues of descent into the mine are too low to admit of horses; and the women, whom it is found necessary to substitute, being obliged to assume a cowering attitude, gradually subside into this unnatural posture (as a fixed memorial of their brutal degra-

dation). The spine in these poor women, slaving on behalf of their children, becomes permanently horizontal, and at right angles to their legs. In process of time they lose the power of bending back into the perpendicular attitude conferred by nature as a symbolic privilege of grandeur upon the human race * * * * * * * * . But these faithful mothers, loyal to their duties, in scorn of their own personal interest, oftentimes excelled in tossing away from them as a worthless derelict, their womanly graces of figure and motion, dedicating and using up these graces as a fund for ransoming their daughters from all similar degradation in time to come."

Now DeQuincey wrote his essay in which this account appears in 1858, two years before the war, yet the assertion cannot be too broadly made that any such general suffering like that described, or any work approaching in toil or results that mentioned as necessitated in the Cumberland mines, was never known by the negroes in the South in the last fifty years, if before.

The name itself is of little consequence, it is the evils incidental to slavery we should endeavor to correct, and mere emancipation is as impotent to accomplish this, as Legislatures, by the enactment of laws, are powerless to suppress the evils of poverty, robbery, vagabondage, prostitution, etc.

Law, like medicine, may change the type of disease, but neither can produce a good constitution.

Count up the negroes who have been hung for crime since the war. Look in our cities and see the thousand negroes crowded into alleys, half starved, ragged and committing all manner of depredations, prostituting themselves to all varieties of vice. Look in our penitentiaries and see the thousands therein confined. Read the statements printed in the *Cincinnati Enquirer* January 27th, 1882, and others to the same effect from many other papers, of the treatment of

convicts in Frankfort and Sing Sing. Reflect that all the Southern penitentiaries and jails, and many of those in the North, are crowded with negro convicts, and say, in what respect has their condition been improved by emancipation. Taking into consideration the lives lost and poverty and suffering entailed on the whites of the South, what has been the net gain effected by inconsiderate and violent legislation? Did slavery, with all the aid of a sentimentalism as shallow as it was ignorant, ever present scenes more barbarous and terrible as does Europe to-day?

Fifty years after it had been declared that Wilberforce had annihilated the slave trade, that trade had increased over fifty per cent., and the sufferings of the slaves both in transit from the interior of Africa to the coast and on the vessels were increased an hundred fold.[d]

"The injuries inflicted by the abolition project may be briefly summed up: The number of negroes imported into America is twice as great as it was, while the mortality in the traffic has increased from fifteen to thirty-three per cent. The evil, in short, has been doubled in extent and doubled in intensity, so that if we take a given increase in extent to be of the same value as the same numerical increase of intensity, we may say that the issue of the struggle which was meant to abolish the evil of the slave trade, has been to quadruple that evil."

This quotation is taken from *Adventures in Africa*, in Henry Howe's *Celebrated Travelers*, and was extracted

[d] "I remember that at the end of 1880, after nine months of the rigid rule of Loris Melikoff, the boast was made that he had exterminated Nihilism, that all the Nihilists were either in prison or driven out of Russia. Three months afterwards the Emperor was assassinated, and his successor has not yet ventured to go through the ceremony of coronation."—*W. Minto in the Fortnightly Review for July*, 1882.

originally from *Chambers' Miscellany*, and represents the result of the efforts to suppress the slave trade as late as 1846. It was in 1787 that Wilberforce first mooted the subject in Parliament. In 1811 the punishment for engaging in the traffic was transportation for fourteen years, or imprisonment at hard labor. This being found inadequate, in 1824 the slave trade was declared piracy, and the punishment death, Great Britain, the United States and Brazil concurring in establishing this as the penalty.

Thus also the present persecution of the Jews in Russia may be considered as one of the results of emancipation in that country. The extract from the New York *Sun*, (January 11th, 1882,) given below,[e] teaches us the position that the peasantry of Russia bears to the land. These Jews who do not own land, but who lend money to the small farmers,

[e] "While the Agrarian Parliament is discussing the question how to satisfy the peasants' demand for more land, the civil agents of the paternal Government continue to profit by their dealings in State lands. Lately a lot of several thousand *desiatina*—a *desiatina* is equal to over two and a half acres—situated in the Orenburg Province, was sold at a public auction in Moscow, nearly a thousand miles from Orenburg, for between $2 and $3 per *desiatina*. If that land had been sold in Orenburg the local peasants would have paid from $14 to $17 per *desiatin* for it; but then the agents of the paternal Government would not have had a chance to get the land for their own benefit at their own price. This practice of buying the State land has become very popular among the Russian bureaucrats. Prince Liven, late Minister of the Domains, bought for himself over a million *desiatina* at about 18 cents per *desiatina*, and his subordinates got tens and hundreds of thousands of *desiatina*, according to their rank. The official statistics show that in 1880 the deficit of Russia was over $68,000,000, and in 1881 it is put at nearly $105,000,000. In the face of famines, epidemics, fires, stagnation of trade, and political troubles at home, the Government expenses are increased every year. For the last twenty years, while the population has increased by 25 per cent., the State ex-

naturally become hated by the peasants, who, *now that they are free*, after paying their landlord their rent and the Jews their interest on money borrowed, finding they have nothing left themselves, naturally vent their anger on those of their "enemies" who, being weakest, are less able to resent their attacks; and education slowly penetrating its way into Russia, the distress of the peasantry seeks outlet in conspiracies and Nihilism. Their prisons increase, exiles are more numerous, while drunkenness is almost universal.

Says Sibree: "Much of the cruelty and indifference to human suffering which undoubtedly existed (in Madagascar) during the reigns of Rodama I. and Ranavolona, were either directly or indirectly caused by European influence.

The misery caused by the slave trade was a direct result of the cupidity and heartlessness of the foreigners, while the desolating wars carried on by both of these sovereigns were an indirect or intended consequence of the very means used

penses have increased 300 per cent.! No wonder, then, that in 1880, for instance, the arrears of taxes amounted $66,000,000. While the peasants are flogged into giving up their last copecks, while their clothes and cattle are sold, and their houses unroofed by the unmerciful tax collectors, the Czar's paternal Government shows an extraordinary liberality to the railroad kings. The Government guarantees loans made by different railroad companies, and pays interest on them. That debt now amounts to some $430,000,000, besides about $1,200,000,000 of State debt."*

*And the following extract from the general and personal column of the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, of April 25th, 1882, shows us how little the peasantry of Russia have gained by the mere proclamation of freedom: "In the Russian Province of Vgatka, out of 1,000 peasants, 797 have been flogged for non-payment of taxes within two years. The Governor had been petitioned for a remission of the payments due, on account of poverty. The police intervened, nevertheless, assembled the rural tribunal, brought the peasants before the Judges, and had them all sentenced to receive so many lashes, threatening that if this were not done they would have the Judges themselves flogged."

by the English government to put a stop to the slave trade."

And in our efforts to suppress polygamy by legislation, we will find that we will only intensify suffering and increase unhappiness and misery. The mass of women who become Mormons come from Europe or our Eastern States, and fly to Mormonism in hope of a change for the better. Mormonism is a result of poverty and ignorance, and we must eradicate the evils which make women turn to the promises of the missionaries of Mormonism, if in our efforts to suppress Mormonism we care to bring about that result without an increase of unhappiness and misery especially to the women and little children. Read the article in *North American Review* for August 2nd, 1882, entitled "Woman's Work and Woman's Wages" and then wonder if you can that Mormons find so little difficulty in finding converts to their doctrine.[g]

[f] "The original inhabitants of the West Indian Islands have disappeared and are succeeded by a mixture of races, of whom the negroes claim our attention now. Among the blacks of Antiqua, as an example, immorality is characteristic. Infanticide is frequently practiced, even since the emancipation bill was passed. The reason for this is clear. Under slavery negroes could not contract a legal marriage: they therefore cohabited and the union lasted as long as their affection or appetite existed. No disgrace attached to a woman who had borne children to several men. Now an idea of feminine virtue has been awakened and they seek to escape the consequences of an illicit amour by destroying its offspring, upon the principle that where no tangible evidence of a crime exists, no crime has been committed."—*Sanger's History of Prostitution, p.* 407.

[g] "The report of our consul at Wurtemberg says: In all parts of Wurtemberg may be seen women splitting and sawing wood * * * * * carrying heavy burdens of fuel, stone, etc., * * * * * threshing with the flail all day * * * * * mounting the ladder with bricks and * * * * performing the duties of scavengers, etc. This statement applies equally to women in all parts of Europe."—*Woman's Work and Women's Wages—Charles W. Elliott, in North American Review, Aug.*, 1882.

Mormonism, indeed, may be in itself a good thing as long as the abject poverty and degrading labor that is characteristic of the Christian civilizations of Europe, continues to unsex and brutalize the women of the lower classes; since Mormonism thus doubtless prevents much suffering, disease and misery, which those who seek in Mormonism an escape from their unhappy fate, would otherwise be subjected to.

Says Huc, in his "*Travels in Tartary, Thibet and China*":

"Polygamy, abolished by the gospel, and contrary in itself to the happiness and concord of families, may perhaps be regarded as a blessing to the Tartars. Considering the present state of society with them, it is, as it were, a barrier opposed to libertinism and corruption of morals, celibacy being imposed on the Lamas (priest) and the class of those who shave the head and live in Lamasaries being so numerous, it is easy to conceive what disorders would arise from this multiplication of young women without support and abandonment to themselves, if girls could not be placed in families in the quality of second wives." (p. 178).

We know of some sensational Protestant ministers who would do well to imitate the example of this sensible Catholic priest and look more for first causes, and endeavor rationally to remove them, before preaching a crusade against secondary ones.

The history of prostitution also clearly shows the impotence of direct attacks to cure or eliminate an evil. Referring to the efforts made by Louis VIII, and Louis IX, to suppress this vice in France, Sanger says:

"A clandestine traffic succeeds to the former open debauchery, and in the dark the evils of the disease were necessarily aggravated. More than that, *as has been the case when prostitution has been violently and suddenly suppressed*, the number of virtuous women became less, and corruption invaded the family circle. Tradesmen complained that since

the passage of the ordinance, they found it impossible to guard the virtue of their wives and daughters against the enterprise of the military and the students."[h]

So true indeed is it, as Mr. Spencer has shown, that:

"Given an average defect of nature among the units of a society and no skillful manipulation of them will prevent that defect from producing its equivalent of bad results."

We claim, however, that the defects of sociological institutions do not depend, as he says, upon the average defects of the units of society, but that they are the necessary results of defective systems of social institutions.[1] And this being so, no perfection of the units of society can ever be attained to correct those miseries, which being due to false ideas of political economy or religion, are too often injurious to the most innocent of the individuals of a community.

Systems being wrong, and yet considered right, no amount

[h] Recognizing the evil results that have followed upon efforts at suppression of prostitution, Mr. Lecky* has spoken of prostitutes as the 'benefactors of womankind, unfortunate priestesses of society.' A conclusion necessitated by his two premises, one obtained as a historian, that all efforts to suppress this evil is productive of increased evil; the other, which he obtains by being a political economist of the orthodox English type, that the 'income of the gentlemen of England is the legitimate wage fund of the people of England.' The conclusion reached in this case ending in mystery and violation of the conclusions of reason as in religious questions, all theological conclusions culminate.

* *Progress of Rationalism in Europe, Vol. II.*

[1] Instead of holding, as Mr. Spencer does, that "non-adaptation of character to circumstances, is the cause of evil," we hold quite the contrary, that the evils and necessities that follow upon a wrongly constituted society are not only the cause of evil, but will ever prevent character from adapting itself to circumstances.

of personal goodness, or exertion by a portion of society, can prevent the results of those systems from being pernicious.

And what we must learn from our short review of the impotency of legislative enactments, of proclamations or of imperial edicts to produce good and suppress evil, is that as long as the basis upon which society is erected is an erroneous one, no amount of laws will prevent evil resulting to society. We may press down and suppress one particular evil, but it soon reappears, and though diguised is yet recognizable, in another quarter. This fact we insist upon more for the benefit of those who, if they persist in obstructing the march of progress and development of social ideas by obnoxious legislation, as in the past, may find cause for grief that they did not, while it was yet time, concern themselves with finding the true cause for present evils, which now can be so readily determined, so easily removed. And, also, it is hoped by these examples to prove to the people that no reformation that will produce beneficial results to them, can be accomplished as long as they devote their attention, and direct their efforts alone, to particular wrongs and oppressions. Anti-monopoly societies, women's rights societies, and all other associations that have for their end the eradication of monopolies, or the elevation of humanity, may continue to agitate forever, but unless they discover and remove that sub-cause, from which all these symptoms of a diseased constitution naturally flow, their efforts will be in vain, or at least, if successful in their particular specialty, the cause which produced that particular manifestation which occasioned their efforts, will inevitably reappear in some other and perhaps more subtle and pernicious form.

Much fault can be found with the treatment the roustabouts receive from the mates of our river boats, but as far as

the negro roustabouts are concerned, better for them the treatment which, bad as it may be, is always intermitted, and seldom amounts to bodily harm, if the alternative presented, is lying in some city prison or starving in some city tenement house. For in the latter case their suffering and condition are persistent, continuous. But it will be said, life with the poorest negro, should not be reduced to these alternatives. True enough, but it is not the province of mates or captains of steamboats to discover happier systems of political economy. This is for those, primarily for those who are indignant at the condition the roustabout does occupy. But in the meanwhile the mate must attend to his duties, and custom has included among these the use of a choice brand of expletives, which he hurls at the negroes from habit, or to facilitate his own duty of supervision. But the mate should not be so profane, should not be quite so handy with his fist and sticks as he sometimes is. True again, but the mate, too, is the creature of circumstances, and if he did not adapt himself to the situation in a manner to produce the desired result, work, he would in all probability have to step down and out, to make way for some other more valuable, or more voluble than himself. Besides the deck of a steamboat is no place to discuss ethics or political economy, or to introduce innovations. Life is too short, and the boat's expenses are too heavy. And yet, again, it is not with the mate we have anything to do at all. The question was the condition of the roustabout. And we hold that bad as that condition often is, it is better to leave him in his present condition, than to take all the boats off the line, because the mates are rough with the employees. This step would not only wreck the fortunes of many an honest captain, who, if bluff and rough, is often a very agreeable

and good hearted kind of a man. And wreck, not only his fortunes, but that of hundreds of others who, innocently enough, may have been making an honest living by the river. Merchants in the cities and their employees, planters and farmers and their employees, all may be brought to disaster by such a remedy. And also thousands of women, loving mothers, tender wives, beautiful, gentle-hearted girls, generous boys, innocent babes, who never thought once of mate or roustabout, may be thereby made to suffer most grievously. Therefore, leave the roustabout where he is, until "*the instincts of truth and light shall be so diffused*" as to make such treatment as he now receives impossible, or until we can discover some field of action, attractive to roustabouts, where they may go and make a living in peace if they desire. This remedy, when found, will rectify things speedily. The owners of this boat will soon suffer in their pockets by the discontent and desertion of their old employees. Recognizing the cause, captains will soon get their instructions, and mates will quickly change their tune. But ere too sweeping action be taken, this remedy should be found, else we not only cause much misery to thousands who are innocent of any wrong in thought or deed, but we actually add to the wrongs and the woes of the roustabout himself. Where will he get employment then? All the boats, in our hypothetical case, being laid up, his occupation's gone, and we can't become professors, merchants or divines on a moment's warning. And while he is preparing to adopt any one of these honorable modes of making a living, who is to find him in meat and bread in the meanwhile? Liberty, alone, is a poor substitute for bread.[1]

[1] "But to poor Serranus and starving Saleius, of what avail will glory be, however great, if it be glory alone?" *Juvenal. VII Satire.*

The condition of many a slave in the South was far preferable in thousands of instances, in many practical respects, not only to the condition of many freedmen after the war, but to the contemporary condition of many men, women and children, who in the Northern States, in England, Scotland and Ireland, had serious reasons to bewail the hollow mockery that may be concealed within a name.[k]

And slavery as it existed in the South prior to the war, perhaps, with exceptions as it still exists in some Oriental countries, was slavery in the mildest form in which it had

[k]That the poorer classes in Europe and the Northern States were often represented as actual slaves, is nothing new to those who have read any of the pamphlets, etc., that from time to time appeared in the South. But expressions of this kind were allowed no weight, from the double reason that it was an imputation on that civilization which characterized England and the North, and because the South, owning slaves, this statement seemed but a begging of the question. But here, twenty years after the war, we find that the statement of a fact that was recognized by the South then, is *now* heralded to the world as a new discovery by a political economist of the orthodox stripe, and whose conclusions in the matter are but conclusions reached by carrying the theories of the present system of political economy to its logical issue. We quote the following from Mr. W. H. Mallock's late work, *Social Equality:*

"Now, in the case of an unskilled slave, during the early stages of progress, this fact is obvious. All civilizations, as I remarked in a former chapter, have begun against the will of the majority of the human beings concerned in them. Social inequality at first has been always inequality in force; or, if we like to put it bluntly, it has been neither more nor less than oppression. But when we pass from the ancient world to the modern, from the age of the slave to the age of the free laborer, it is not, perhaps, obvious as regards this special question, what happened during the transition. How, in the manner in which the motive to labor acts upon him, does the unskilled free laborer differ from the unskilled slave? In many of his circumstances he, of course, differs profoundly. He cannot be sold; he can move from place to place; he can choose his own work and his own master; above all, he can save, and as long as his sav-

ever existed in any nation. And, judging from the advance in humanity during the last fifty years, we are authorized to infer that, with the constant advance made in literature, in education, and in the spirit of liberty, that the condition of slaves would have been constantly ameliorated.

For, in the South, before the war, the development of a purer humanity, that was being gradually accomplished by the increase of knowledge, art, and the spirit of liberty, was not nullified and offset by an ever-increasing poverty among the people; for while there was no great wealth

ings last him, no living being can compel him to labor at all. But whenever, and in so far as unskilled labor is being done by him, he is essentially in the same position as the slave. The labor he is doing is motived in such a way that it does more than satisfy the wants by which it is motived. That is, whenever he produces anything, he is obliged to produce more than personally he has any wish to produce; or more, in other words, than he would be able to produce without some external force acting on him. Here, then, in our latest civilization, we encounter the same fact which we have just noted in the earliest. We find that the lower forms of labor can be made productive only by the application of force in some way to the laborer. It appears, therefore, that in the gradual abolition of slavery, what has really happened has been this: The force that once resided in one dominant class has gradually passed from that into the structure of society generally. The unskilled laborer has ceased to be at the mercy of a master; but the force that the master once applied capriciously is now applied to him, instead, by his whole social environment, and that not capriciously, but with the regularity of a natural law."—p. 191.

Without stopping to inquire how much the "*slave*" has gained by this change of masters, the principal practical question that should interest us is, how much longer will the "cultured few" be able to apply this "force," this "oppression," to the great majority? How much longer can Mr. Mallock and his brother economists expect the mass of the people to remain quiescent under his and their teachings, and under the systems that are the result of their cogitations?

in the hands of the few, the greatest source of wealth being in the shape of individuals who had to be well fed, and on the whole, excellently well treated to make them valuable, all the intelligence of the South possessed an easy competency. Those who were known as the "poor whites" were, as a rule, only so called by the negroes and people not Southerners; and they owed this appellation to the fact that, as compared to the negro, they were poor, considering that they had the great natural advantage of being white.[l] But even the poorest of these "poor whites" always had a piece of land that he could call his own, or land which he at least occupied rent free; he had his cabin, his dog, his gun and fishing-rod; and if he lacked the education of the richer whites, his condition was, as far as he knew it, anything but an unfortunate one. While with the slave owners, their prosperity was the result of kindness that was ever increasing among those who inherited their slaves, that is, the older families, and their prosperity was followed by the general prosperity and comfortable circumstances of the slaves, and an increasing kindness to them by all classes.

And there is no reason to doubt but what the standard of ethics would have naturally developed to an extent as to have rendered the manumission of slaves by their owners more and more frequent, and that to this cause ultimately all the slaves would have owed their liberty.[m] And in the

[l] "Poor Buckrah" and "white trash" were terms always in the mouths of the negroes themselves when they wanted to express contempt—phrases exceeded in meaning only by another, frequently used in altercations, or when speaking of a worthless darkey, "free nigger" was, of all the insults that could be offered a negro, the most galling and exasperating.

[m] "That the condition of slaves within the United States has been improved, and the rigors of slavery mitigated, by the establishment and

meanwhile, the condition of those still retained as slaves, would have grown gradually better and better, until slavery would have become merely nominal.[n] That this amelioration of condition was gradually and surely being accomplished, let those who will doubt compare the treatment of slaves a hundred years ago with the treatment slaves received at the hands of their masters in the South at the time of the war. A strong corroboration of this statement is found in the behavior of the slaves themselves during the war.

Left for nearly four years masters of the situation in the country, with all Southern men not too old for service at the front, with millions of women and children at their mercy,

progress of our free government, is a fact that imparts consolation to all who have taken pains to inquire concerning it. The disproportionate increase of free persons of color can be explained only by the supposition that the practice of emancipation is gaining ground, a practice which there is reason to believe would become more general if a plan could be devised by which the comfort and morals of the emancipated slaves could be satisfactorily provided for."*—*From speech of Hon. Rufus King in the Senate (session of 1818--19) against the admission of slavery into the Territory of Missouri.*

*"In England, as the spirit of liberty gained ground, the very name and idea of personal servitude, without any formal interposition of the Legislature to prohibit it, was totally banished."—*Robertson's History of the Middle Ages, p. 25.*

[n]"When this is done and this unhallowed and unnatural war (by the Abolitionists) upon Southern interest and institutions shall cease, we believe that the natural goodness of heart, the wisdom, philanthropy and Christianity of the people of the Slave States will lead them either to devise a plan for the complete removal of slavery, in harmony with the interests and feelings of both master and slave, or to ameliorate the physical, moral and intellectual condition of the slaves, that their separation from their masters would, like that of Hagar from Abraham, partake more of cruelty and persecution than of kindness and Christian charity." —*Bible Defense of Slavery, p. 423, by Josiah Priest, A. M.*, 1851.

yet through all that time we look in vain for one massacre, one well attested case of insubordination. This is not the way that people with such excitable imaginations as negroes are known to have, are wont to act towards those who have systematically ill-treated them.

That this high standard of moral development had been attained by many in the South, the example of many Southern men in freeing their slaves and providing for them, will attest.° That manumissions were not more frequent and on a larger scale, in spite of the education that existed, and the love of liberty and general development of humanity, was due entirely to two causes: First, the teachings of the Bible.

°"Illness detained Jefferson from attending the assembly of the Virginia delegates who met in 1774 to discuss the grievances the colonies labored under as English dependencies, but he sent for inspection a paper which foreshadowed the Declaration of Independence. It was presented by Peyton Randolph and printed by some of the delegates. Enumerating the grievances which affected all the colonies, it made a special complaint of a wrong to Virginia. 'For the most trifling reasons,' said he, 'and sometimes for no conceivable reasons at all, his Majesty has rejected laws of the most salutary tendency. The abolition of domestic slavery is the great object of desire in those colonies where it was unhappily introduced in their infant state. But previous to the enfranchisement of the slaves we have, it is necessary to exclude all further importations from Africa. Yet our repeated attempts to effect this by prohibitions and by imposing duties which might amount to a prohibition, have been hitherto defeated by his Majesty's negative, thus preferring the immediate advantage of a few British corsairs to the lasting interests of the American States, and to the rights of human nature, deeply wounded by this infamous practice.' "—*Bancroft's United States, Vol. VII., p.* 84.*

*"My friends and I," wrote Oglethorpe, "settled the colony of Georgia, and by charter were established trustees. We determined not to suffer slavery there, but the slave merchants and their adherents not only occasioned us much trouble, but at last got the government to sanction them."—*Bancroft's United States, Vol. III., p.* 416.

Twenty years ago thousands, both North and South, thought that slavery was directly instituted and favored by God, and, as with the persecution and belief in witches "the nascent scepticism, that started at tales, such as these was hushed before the witness of the Bible"; as of old to question the existence of sorcerer or witches, seemed to question the veracity of the Scriptures themselves. Pity fell before the stern injunction, 'Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live,' and the squire who would have shrunk from any conscious cruelty as from a blow, looked on without ruth as the torturers ran needles into the witch's flesh, or swam her in the witch's pool, or hurried her to the witch's stake.[p]" So, many a tender nature, that naturally would be inclined to question the right to hold slaves, was fully answered in the affirmative by his religion in proportion to his faith in the Bible,[q] did he believe in the justness of the peculiar institution. To a man who could believe that all negroes were the descendants of Ham, whom Noah cursed and condemned to be a slave to his brethren, and a Christian could not well believe otherwise, it seemed the most natural thing in the world that the descendants of Canaan should still continue slaves, since there had been received no second Revelation to declare otherwise.

The other cause was self-interest. This self-interest owed its power to ownership of land. If the South had been

[p] *History of the English People*, by John R. Green.

[q] "Thus we believe that sufficient evidence appears from the Scriptures of the judicial appointment of that (the African) people to servitude. In view of this belief and of that fact, the inquiry naturally arises here, whether it is a sin to enslave a negro. To this we are compelled, *even against our sympathies and preconceived opinions* arising out of our education, to answer *no*, it is no sin in principle."—*Bible Defense of Slavery, p.* 101, *by Josiah Priest, A. M., of Glasgow, Ky.*

barren or cut up into small farms of forty or fifty acres, slavery could not have existed. Now in the North, one of these conditions, self-interest, being absent, the people of New England realized more quickly than did the heavily interested South, the fact, that despite the Bible, slavery was an evil.[r] That manumissions were not more frequent was due, as we thus see, to the teachings of the Bible, supplemented by a powerful self-interest, and that this self-interest arose from private ownership of land. If either of these influences had been absent, human nature, under conditions as favorable to its development as existed in this country before the war, would have become sufficiently good and grand to have ultimately produced universal emancipation.

The proof that slavery owed its long continuance to Bible teachings and self-interest, is given by the fact, that where neither self-interest nor religion suggests or creates slavery, then human nature is quick to produce great manifestations of pity for slaves; so great indeed, that, like every other species of enthusiasm, this manifestation is apt to produce mischief in the society it develops in, and against the interest of the very slaves themselves. Thus during the first centuries of Christianity, as the followers of the new religion were nearly all poor men and women and *did not own* slaves, and as the slaves were mostly *white*, and as there was nothing in the story of Ham and the curse of Canaan that could be applied to them, the bishops and other Christians of that time, by force of natural goodness, untrammelled by dogma or interest, became zealous in their labors for the freedom of slaves.

[r] "Of slavery in New England there was not enough to affect the character of the people except in the south-east of Rhode Island, where Newport was conspicuous for engaging in the slave trade, and where in two or three other towns negroes composed over a third of the population." *Bancroft's United States, Vol. IV, p.* 150.

Ultimately, then, had there been no war the growth of scepticism, the spread of knowledge, the growing spirit of liberty, would have opened the way for the emancipation of the slaves by peaceful measures. By that time, too, the remodelled science of political economy would have been ready to dispose of them as freemen. To one who is qualified to view the matter from a sociological eminence, the Emancipation Proclamation, regarded as a reform measure, and without reference to its political aspect, may have revealed more enthusiasm than judgment on the part of those who, ignoring comparative evils, and the growth of institutions, were so readily captivated by an abstract idea, or swayed by an emotion, as to perpetrate an act in the face of the evils that reflection would have shown as likely to follow upon a ruthless disruption of a part of the social fabric of our country, would yet precipitate upon the descendants of those who fought for the liberty, and legislated for the interest of that country, this "reform." Such a person might question the motives of those who, in spite of the evils that might have been foreseen would come upon the freed slaves, who, ignorant and unprepared with homes or vocations of their own, would have been subject to much more acute suffering than many of them had felt while slaves, if it had not happened that the Slave States offered them employment, and thus prevented many of the evils that would have ensued had these freedmen been left no work other than they might find in the crowded cities and more thickly populated North. And who, in spite of the hate that was foreseen would divide for so long the people of the country, should still have persisted in the execution of their idea. In the next great question of reform that will agitate this country it will remain to be seen how disinterested was the philanthropy of the North.

True it is that this last war, "fought for an idea," brought fortune and honor to the conquerors. True it is that many noble houses date their nobility from that crisis in our country's history. True it was that millions upon millions were first borrowed by the government, and afterwards repaid with highly satisfactory interest. Which millions were invested in buying material, the manufacture or sale of which made the fortunes of thousands; or were paid to soldiers who squandered these thousands to the great benefit of many shopkeepers and whisky sellers, who now refer very unctiously to the war and their patriotism, and who damn the "rebels" with a hearty but with a very thoughtless zeal. All this was true of the last war, of the last reform. How much moved will the North be, how patriotic, how disinterested, when the great "moral idea" will embrace, not the devastation of somebody else's property and prosperity, with great net gain for themselves, but something universal in its results—free lands instead of free men. When that time comes, then let New England and the Scandinavians, the Germans and the Swedes of the West, display the same enthusiasm for the abstract principles of right, when the consequences may affect themselves, that they did so nobly show when the consequences were to be felt by others; and the South will forget how Marion fought and starved, how Jasper fought and fell, how Lee and Sumpter fought and won, how Washington fought and saved a country grand enough to offer refuge to the oppressed of all nations, and generous enough to give them homes when they came; will forget—what did we say? Will rejoice, will exult, that in the one we may claim compatriots, in the others, citizens worthy of the blood it cost to win their homes and country for them!

Will forget that New England has, for the last fifty years, acted towards the South as though the South had introduced and encouraged* the importation of slaves into this country.

Will forget that New England, also, owned slaves and, when they ceased to be profitable, in many instances, sold them to the South.

To find the cause of a disease is of much, to discover the remedy is of far greater importance; and to determine what means or methods are to be used in applying that remedy when the evil is vast and of long continuance, and the remedy novel and, perhaps, alarming, is the most delicate and refined, the most important and the most difficult problem of all.

To discover and successfully apply a remedy for a diseased national constitution, for the removal of vast wrongs that have been innocently inflicted, because they were the necessary result of causes whose malignant power for evil were not suspected, and which have been doing their deadly and insidious work for hundreds of years; to apply this rem-

* "The English Continental Colonies, in the aggregate, were always opposed to the African slave trade; Maryland, Virginia and even Carolina, alarmed at the excessive production and the consequent low prices of their staples, at the heavy debts incurred by the purchase of slaves on credit, and the dangerous increase of the colored population, each showed an anxious preference for the introduction of white men, and laws designed to restrict importations of slaves are scattered copiously along the records of colonial legislation."*—*Bancroft's United States, Vol. III, p,* 410, 411.

* "In 1776 the Earl of Dartmouth illustrated the tendency of the colonies and the policy of England by addressing to a colonial agent these memorable words: 'We cannot allow the colonies to check or discourage, in any degree, a traffic so beneficial to the nation.'"—*Bancroft's United States, Vol. III, p.* 416.

edy without endangering the existence of that constitution, without peril to social organization, without detriment to the material prosperity of that country, and without awakening the passions and the prejudices of men, is indeed a subject that in its demand for thought, disinterestedness and knowledge, possesses every claim to the serious attention of the philosopher, the statesman, the philanthropist, the Christian and the patriot.

Mr. John Stuart Mill's suggestion that land be rendered inoperative for futher evil by confiscating to the government future increase in value, is, to say the least, such a vague and impracticable remedy as to divest it of any real importance.

And Mr. George's idea of confiscating the rent of land to the government, leaving title of possession with present owners, is as little likely to be acceptable to the landlords as the more wild and furious suggestion of the communist. In either case the present owner loses that which gives his land any value to him. A man who lives on the income derived from rent of his land, would not see any difference between two plans both of which resulted in leaving him minus that income. And without going into the merits of the various plans that have been proposed by others, with a view to remedying the evil arising from private ownership of land, we may say this much, at least, that the idea of Mr. Mill is practically useless, and that of Mr. George and the communist are unnecessary, and in any event, would excite so much passion that, if possible, they are to be avoided until the last moment. We, however, agree with Professor George that the country generally, the land-owners as well, would be great gainers by the reform even it had to be effected in the way he suggests.

But the trouble is to make people think so, and while much time would be necessary to educate the people to that way of thinking, it is possible that by the adoption of some other scheme the revolution may be accomplished immediately and agreeably. And in submitting the plans which it will be the purpose of this chapter to unfold, we are actuated by motives entirely disinterested; and while fully alive to the necessity of the measure, we are anxious that none shall fancy that they have cause for grievance, or will feel in any way injured when that great, that glorious, that day of all days for the future of our country, shall come; when we can truly say that America *is* free. Fortunately, in our opinion, we will not be called upon in this matter to determine between the claims of adverse factions. It is only necessary to show all that the interests of all are involved in the happy solution of this question, and to submit a scheme that will be satisfactory to all in its quiet methods and beneficial results.

The first of these plans that we will suggest, will be, in our opinion, the one to be adopted. It is the most complete, and will bring about the desired result at once; and we, now living, can reasonably hope to find a great satisfaction ten years from its adoption, comparing the new order of things with the old.

In all great measures, involving great reforms, if it is possible to get the consent of those interested, it is best to accomplish the fact at once. A bather should not be enticed under *false pretenses*, nor shoved into the water *unawares* or *against* his will; but after he has made up his mind to bathe he should plunge in boldly.

The first plan is that the government buy up all the lands now in possession of corporations or private individuals, the

price to be appraised by government officers, or by appraisers selected for that purpose by each county; or, finally, by paying for them at the prices they were valued at by the owners, as reported to the tax collectors in the year previous to the year when the act authorizing such purchase should be passed by Congress. All lands, that is, outside the corporate limits of all cities and all towns of one thousand population and over; to buy this land just as an individual would buy portions of it, only, no cash need be paid, but buy, say, on fifty year's time. The government giving its notes (greenbacks) payable one-tenth in five years, one-tenth in ten years and so on; one-tenth every five years until the indebtedness thus incurred should be liquidated. Notes to bear 7 per cent. interest *after maturity*, and to be guaranteed by a ground tax on land.

For the purpose of elucidating this plan, we shall go a little into details, and shall use figures which if not exact, will be sufficiently so to show us how readily it could be put into operation and how easily it could be carried through to successful completion. If we secure the correct system the details and results will justify themselves, or at any rate the details would furnish our politicians with something of practical importance to occupy their minds for the next few years.

The total area of the United States, including all the territories, is 2,311,579,166 acres. Deducting Washington and Alaska territories, and the Indian Territory, would leave 1,953,099,800 acres. It may be safely estimated that government lands, rivers, swamps, mountains and cities amount to one-fifth of this, which would leave 1,562,479,840 acres for the government to purchase.

The amount which, owing to its barrenness and inaccessibility, and the amount held by railroads, that could be

bought for an average of $6,00 per acre, would probably be equal to 562,479,840; this at $6,00 per acre would take $3,374,879,040 to purchase. The remaining billion acres we may estimate at $20,00 per acre. The total amount to be paid out then would be, say, in round numbers, $23,500,000,000.[t] Truly a debt that is bewildering, and calculated to daunt the minds of our political economist and capitalist.

But let us examine the matter a little, and see if the idea is so wild and impracticable as at first sight it may appear. Let us divide this grand total which, for the sake of round numbers, and to make our calculations on a basis large enough, we will make $24,000,000,000, instead of $23,500,000,000; divide it into ten equal parts, for, remember, we do not undertake to pay all this debt at once, and, indeed, we want five years to enable us to provide for each one-fifth payment as it will become due. The first payment we would have to meet five years from the date of the passage of the act of Congress authorizing the purchase, and this amount being one-tenth of the entire debt, would be $2,400,000,000. But at the time Congress passes this act it should also pass another, should decree in fact, that on every acre of land or fraction thereof, occupied or used, the occupant or user should pay a ground rent of say $3,00 per acre. Taking it for granted that there would be 250,000,000 acres[u] of land occu-

[t] Total value of farms in United States, as shown by the census of 1880, $10,197, 094,805.

[u] According to the census report of 1880 there were planted in wheat, rye, oats, barley, buckwheat, potatoes, tobacco, hay and cotton, 164,710,567 acres of land. No account, it will be seen, is given of the number of acres occupied for grazing purposes, turpentine farms, or rice planting, and estimating 95,000,000 acres as being occupied in this manner and in gardens, and in building lots, we see that even now, under present disadvantages, the estimate of 250,000,000 is a moderate one.

pied or cultivated, 5,000,000 farmers using 50 acres each, the annual income at $3,00 per acre from this source would net $750,000,000,[v] and in five years the government would have taken up and destroyed, making a little allowance for increase of farmers and other occupants of land after the first year, $3,750,000,000; and deducting $250,000,000 for the payment of such expenses as may have been necessitated in collecting this tax, etc., or that may have been incurred in adopting this measure, the government would have absorbed by this ground tax all of the notes due on the first payment, and $1,000,000,000 of those that would not be due for five years later.

[v] "According even to the statistics in the so-called New Doomsday Book, a compilation got out expressly in the interest of the landlords, (of England) 2,192 persons hold 38,726,848 of the total small area of Great Britain and Ireland, the people having been driven completely from the soil. Mr. Bright's statement that 30,000 people hold the agricultural lands of Great Britain, is positively very near the truth. Reckoning rents, royalties and ground-rents, it is calculated that the land owners take not less than £135,000,000 out of their countrymen owing to the monopoly they enjoy."—*The Coming Revolution in England*, H. M. Hyndman, in *North American Review for October*, 1882. How light is the tax, we suggest, can be seen from the above. England's workingmen, some 28 millions, pay to the owners of land (as above stated), $675,000,000, while on nearly 50 million people the proposed tax would only be $750,000,000, to continue only for 30 or 40 years, and could be diminished readily to $500,000,000.*

*The value of corn, wheat, rye, oats, barley, buckwheat, potatoes, tobacco, hay and cotton crops of 1880, in the United States was, according to census report..... $2,131,051,859

Value of live stock was..... 1,701,795.232

$3,832.847,091

Making a total of value in these alone of nearly $4,000,000,000. Now estimating the value of all the houses, both dwelling houses and other kinds, at another billion, and the amount that would be annually collec-

This would leave the government in the sixth year of the operation of this act with an indebtedness of $1,400,000,000 due five years later, with an annual income of about $800,000,000 (would average this at least) derived from the land. On this tenth year, then, the government will not only have plenty of funds to meet this $1,400,000,000, but would have absorbed all of this amount, and allowing this time $400,000,000 for expenses of collections, etc., in the second five years, $2,200,000,000 of the third payment; leaving, in fact, only $200,000,000 of notes outstanding against it in the third payment. With an ever increasing income that would enable it not only to absorb these when they were due, but all of the entire fourth payment and nearly

ted of $750,000,000,000 would be only fifteen per cent. of the wealth of the country, estimating that these $5,000,000,000 constituted the entire wealth; and when we take into consideration the value of the lumber and ice crop annually produced, of the iron, coal, gold, hemp and wool crop, it will be seen that the proposed tax would only amount to six or seven per cent. of the wealth of the country, whereas, under present conditions the tax is variously estimated to be from 33⅓ to 45 per cent., and this falling wholly upon the labor, agriculture and otherwise, of the country. If Mr. Turner, of Tennesse, in his speech in Congress recently, was anywhere near right, it will be seen what a great load this method would lift off the people. He said that the amount paid to manufacturers in the country by the people in excess of what they would have had to pay, if not for protection tariffs, was $2,000,000,000, this in excess of all other taxes, which amount is 40 per cent. paid in taxation on the value of the annual crops, cattle, houses, etc., as above estimated in the country. And as it is now admitted by all who pay any attention to political economy, that "labor is the creator of all capital," and that labor pays all the taxes, "for," says the *Globe-Democrat*, "these propositions upon analysis have been found to be true," (see *Globe-Democrat*, June 19th, 1882,) it can be readily seen that the difference between the taxation proposed under the suggested systems and that now annually raised, would go to the people—the farmers and other laborers.

half of the fifth payment due twenty-five years from the passage of the act. And by this process, our debt continually growing less, our income continually growing greater, at the expiration of thirty-five or forty years, we would have absorbed our entire indebtedness. The country would be the richer by every stroke of work, every throb of labor, every pulsation of industry that had occurred in the meantime, and all this wealth would be in tangible shape on top of the ground, absorbing no wealth; the land would be free and the people owing nothing for it.

This money which would be thus put in the country, could not possibly effect any but good results. For, in the first place, it would be paid out only to those who at present own land, had land to give in exchange for it. To the men of settled habits, and with moral and social surroundings, that would prevent their rushing into excesses that would be injurious to the moral or physical welfare of the nation. In a word, to the commercially and literarily educated, to the solid men of the country. Men who would not be apt to indulge in senseless and pernicious forms of extravagance. For in wealth as in education or power, the rule holds good, that a system whose tendency is to produce equalization of condition, will be followed by wholesome results. Equalization from a lower to a higher plane.

Wealth is only to be feared when it is confined by the operations of law, of systems, to the few, and when the large majority are, not only not wealthy, but poverty stricken, or by the fear of poverty, demoralized. With great wealth in the hands of many and no class bound to poverty by exclusion from land, extravagance amongst the wealthy could only take the form of dress, furniture, buildings, carriages, art, etc., which would all necessitate an

expenditure of money that would be taken in payment by those who produced or furnished these things.

But sensual extravagance by the rich, or crimes practiced by the poor that are produced by the hope of money as a reward for the necessities that money will buy; or produced by fear of suffering, would cease, since the same or greater wealth could be obtained by work; work that would not be ignoble, or attended with danger or shame; not depressing or disappointing, but work ennobling to the worker and honorably regarded by others, and attended with rewards greater in amount and more permanent in duration. And whatever the extravagance of the wealthy might be in decorations, in art or building, it could not be prejudicial, since no form that this wealth could assume would absorb, *without the consent of the people*, by virtue of its form, the money in the country. These articles purchased would be, perhaps, worth to the purchaser the money exchanged for them, but none of them could take, *nolens volens*, more than the first purchase money, whereas now, if invested in land, the original purchase money is soon taken back, and is a constant drain ever after of the money of the people.

Monopolies would be broken up, for capital would be so abundant, it would be hopeless for any clique to attempt to control it. Competition would regulate commerce, manufactories, railroads, etc., as in some measure it, combined with legislation, does now. With this advantage, however, over the present system, that competition prices would be limited by natural means; by the comparative returns farm labor would yield to those who, if pressed too hard by the effect of competition, could obtain lands to cultivate for themselves, rather than accept factory prices or railway compensation for their labor. Poor men who desired to be-

come farmers could obtain assistance then more readily than they can now; and yet, at present three-fourths of our farmers have to obtain money and supplies on credit to do the same thing And the security would be, to say the least, as good; for those who are now able to obtain loans to run their places, by mortgaging their farms, would, by the sale of these farms, obtain cash themselves to loan. Every farmer or planter who would thus be in a position to occupy the office of capitalist, would, by past observation, acquaintance or experience, know to whom they could safely lend money, to purchase plows, seed, food, teams, etc., with which to raise a crop, and they would have the assurance of knowing, that those tenants who had paid obligations, incurred for the same end under the old system, when they had a rental of from five to ten dollars to pay for the use of land; and who had, in addition, to purchase supplies on which a profit ranging from 50 to 100 per cent. was made by the merchant, who sold on credit of six, eight and twelve months, would the more easily and readily pay his obligations when that rental was reduced from one-half to two-thirds, and prices at which they could get supplies, could be bought for cash, on a margin of from eight to twelve per cent. For the abundance of money in the hands of those, *who, not being able to buy land, would be anxious to lend, would keep interest on loans at a minimum; and the desire of merchants to secure quick sales, would, for cash, keep prices at a minimum of profit.*

Those tenants or laborers whose past records were not of a character to secure them this accomodation, could by daily labor, wages being higher, soon obtain enough money to begin farming on their own account, and by their own means. That is if they should be frugal and industrious. And if they, from habits formed under the old order of affairs, could not

be economical and sober, they would be no worse off than they are at present: with this advantage attending the proposed freeing of land, that, when in the course of nature they passed away, others would be ready, who under happier auspices, trained and educated under other surroundings, would be able and willing to be industrious, economical and sober.

Medicine for thousands of years professed to be able to cure diseases; so our old systems of political economy professed to be able to cure the ills arising from poverty. We are but now beginning to see that hygiene, while it makes but little pretentions to curative powers, is very efficient as a preventive of diseases. So, the new system of political economy that would arise self-erected from the basis of free lands, would not pretend to be able to cure all the diseased conditions that had arisen by reason of false teachings and poverty, necessitated by exclusion from land, but it would be able to prevent any re-occurence of poverty from this cause.

We copy a part of an article on "tramps," and also a paragraph on another subject, from the *Nashville Ledger*, March, 17th, 1882. Both articles are from the same issue.[w] These will illustrate what we hope to be able to accomplish by making land free, not the reclamation of all vagabonds and

[w] "TRAMPS—SOMETHING ABOUT THIS UBIQUITOUS PERSONAGE.—It is a disgrace to our good old land of chivalry, to be compelled to admit of their being here, and in well organized bodies to boot. Many of these vagabonds are mechanics, and as such would readily gain a comfortable existence, but that honest labor is less venerated by them than the prowling, sneaking, begging and thieving life of the worst class of all Bohemians. There is remedy for the malady though, as the disease is a desperate one, the treatment must be severe to insure a radical cure.

Revive the whipping post, and to its altar of horrors let the fully convicted subject be led, there to be belabored by trusty and strong-armed

tramps, but to inaugurate a condition of affairs that will enable the boys referred to, and there are millions of them, to continue to work. Under our present system six out of eight of these boys will become either of the class of tramps referred to, or will become gamblers, loafers, or will marry some woman for her money hoping thereby to avoid work.

Manufactories, railroads, ship building, canal making, and a thousand other industries would awaken into new life and spring into a vivified existence. All work would receive an impetus that would be constantly increasing the wealth of the country, and improving the condition of the workers; and this at an ever increasing ratio of progress. Consequently there would spring up a demand for these notes, these greenbacks, and this demand would keep these notes on a par with gold.

The expense necessary to carry on the government was, for the year 1881, only about $112,000,000, add to this the interest on the public debt already incurred, and allowing liberally for increase of expenses (not such as would be incurred by the passage of the land bill) and $250,000,000 would be sufficient to cover all our national expenses.

In order not to alarm public creditors our present tariff could be retained for awhile, as we now have it, and also all the existing internal revenue taxes. But while for

wardens; this is the meet they merit for a life of vagabondism, menacing, plundering," etc.

"One of the most commendable acts that is shown by some of our little white boys, is the zeal with which they seek some kind of employment to aid their mothers and fathers. A great many have discarded mock modesty and "I am too good for that," and will tackle a load of wood, or cord, and store it away for you for a little pay, showing that they feel it no shame or degradation to work and make an honest penny. Keep this up, boys, it will make men of you--useful men. You are the gainers."

the sake of appeasing alarm, this could be adopted, we think there is no question but that it would be far more to the public good, and contribute much to the unhampered operation of the beneficial system of a political economy, which, based upon free land, would quickly develop into systematic order and blossom in universal prosperity, if we would at once impose an import duty upon all articles that are raised or manufactured in the United States so high as to be prohibitory.[x] Leaving only a moderate duty upon other articles, such as coffee, tea, etc., that are not raised in this country, or such manufactured articles that Americans may not have the art or the ability to make. This course would secure us the quickest result to be obtained by our own internal development. The abundance of money that would be seeking investments would originate manufactories in sufficient quantities to produce a competition that would reduce profits to the level of profits to be obtained in all departments of industry.

A merchant or manufacturer who may be losing money by his business, does not attempt to rectify the evil by economizing on his daily allowance of cigars, or by abbreviating other trifling expenses; he changes his methods of doing business. He goes to the root of the evil, and reforms his system. And for a whole nation to hope, or attempt to win prosperity or avert calamity by merely dickering with or relying on changes in tariffs alone, is worse than would be the idiocy of a millionaire manufacturer, who should, to avert loss, or change loss into prosperity, attempt to effect this by

[x] Adopting a free trade policy, however, with such nations that would put themselves on the same footing. Free trade with all nations who also would make their lands free, and heavy protection against those who adhered to the old system.

abridging the petty details of his personal expenses. The profits of one week's labor by every man and boy over sixteen years of age in this country, would be more than sufficient to pay all the expenses of our National Government for one year.

In short, there would follow upon the adoption of this or some similar land law, all the benefits to our industries that would follow upon the inauguration of a great war, without the bloodshed that war would bring, and without the after contraction which under our present economic and financial theories would be necessitated.

By the adoption of this plan, we would be able to put into practical operation the idea of the Greenback party. So much of it at least as was desirable and practical; for by adopting the scheme proposed, we would be able to effect several objects which, as the Greenbackers are now organized, they are unable satisfactorily to do. First, we would be able to determine *how* this money was to be put into circulation, and second to *whom* it was to be paid, and third, *what amount* was sufficient to accomplish the desired end. We would also have a basis of guarantee that would render the amount paid out equivalent to gold or silver. For, if Congress should guarantee to maintain the tax on land until this money was absorbed, it would be only a question of time when the whole amount would be taken up, and its place would be gradually, but effectively, supplied by the representatives (gold and silver) of the increased wealth of the nation, that would accrue by increase of population and industry. And, finally, by this plan, we will have provided against the necessity for any *similar issue in the future.* For this money would represent the value of land as now appraised. And fifty years hence, the purchase money being

taken up by ground rent, the wealth in the country at that time would be equal to what it would have been at any rate, *plus* the value that land would have been worth if it still remained the property of individuals. And as we may safely assume, that land will double in value with our present ratio of increase of population kept up, every twenty-five years, in fifty years the country will have made by this operation, all that the labor of its people can accomplish in that time and the value twice over of the purchase money, viz: about $48,000,000,000. And, as what money that would be made would be paid only to those who labored in some form or another, these notes will have been distributed in the main to those who had worked[r] and not to those who had bought land a few years previously, or who had owned it for a longer time. And hence, the wealth of the country would be divided up with some regard to merit and not with regard to possession of land and, consequently, being more uniformly distributed, there would be no necessity for any re-issue of greenbacks.

In determining the question of how much land a man could claim for himself, we may say that one hundred acres would furnish employment for so many of an ordinary family as would work at farming, and who would be too young to claim land on their own account. The following suggestions are made to show how the division could be regulated:

[r]Thus taking the first and necessary step towards the realization of the hope conveyed in the following remarks from the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, of January 13th, 1882.:

"If human wisdom ever extends so far as to subject every individual to the spur of necessity in order that he may get out of his faculties all they are capable of comfortably producing, the world will be immensely the gainer."

Every present owner of land, after selling all his land to the government, if he is the head of a family, should have the privilege of retaining one hundred acres of that which he may prefer of his old place, by paying, of course, the government tax, which, in this estimate, we have supposed to be three dollars per acre; and he might be allowed the further privilege of keeping, in addition to this one hundred, fifty acres more by paying, say, five dollars per acre. the idea of raising the price on the last being to discourage more than one holding. The rest of his land, if he has any more, to be divided out as the tenants on the place may determine among themselves, but no single man to appropriate more than fifty acres, nor any head of a family to take more than one hundred, but this much, if there was land enough to go around among the tenants at this rate, and he was willing to pay the government tax on it and use it.[z] Settlers seeking homes in new countries, or settling on land not improved, could take up the same amount, subject to the same conditions. *For, as for the first ten or twenty years, no man would be obliged to go far west for land, there would be but little choice between the land that would be occupied,* and if, in the future, a greater population would compel a man to occupy land not so fertile or so valuable, in other

[z] To insure the payment of such tax as may be levied on land, we might, with advantage, borrow a law from China. By the 90th section (of the penal Code) "those lands are forfeited which the proprietor does not register in the public records of government, acknowledging themselves responsible for the payment of taxes upon them."*—*China and the Chinese, by John Francis Davis.*

The desire of each tenant of government, to insure his *permanent and secure possession of land he had settled on, would secure, under such a law, a registration that would guarantee the payment of rent to the government.*

*In some cases the land is given free of rent; this to the poor, or to secure the cultivation of poor lands.

respects, as some lands that were obtained at first for the same rent, *the very reasons that would enforce him to take inferior land, a dense population, would render this land worth as much as a more desirable piece would have been in a less densely populated country.* Fifty acres of poor land twenty miles from New York are worth more than fifty acres of rich land in Texas or Nebraska; and the same reason that makes this difference will make the poor lands of Texas more valuable, to a farmer or any one else, in fifty years hence, than the rich lands of Texas are worth now. The increase of population will be the cause of this greater value.

And if we do not devise some means to get possession of this land for the people, all the benefit that will arise from this growth of population will accrue to those few who, at present, own the lands, and fifty years from now some farmer who, because of present low rents, may be willing to close his eyes to ultimate results, and may flatter himself that "'tis well to let well enough alone" will transmit to his children a land so burdened with rent as to make it only possible by continuous work to make money enough to pay that rent. John Richard Green, in his History of the English People, takes occasion to place on record an instance of the growth in the value of land that followed a long peace and settled government that Americans might do well to make a note of.

"My father," says Latimer, "was a yeoman, and had no lands of his own; only he had a farm of three or four pounds by the year at the uttermost, and hereupon he tilled so much as kept a half dozen men. He had walk for one hundred sheep, and my mother milked thirty kine. He was able and did find the King a harness with himself and his horse while he came to the place that he

should receive the King's wages. * * * * He kept me to school; he married my sisters with four pounds apiece, so that he brought them up in Godliness and fear of God. He kept hospitality for his poor neighbors, and some alms he gave to the poor, and all this he did of the same farm, where he that now hath it payeth sixteen pounds by year, or more, and is not able to do any thing for his prince, for himself, nor for his children, or give a cup of drink to the poor."

And when this is the condition of America, as it will right speedily be if not now provided against, it will matter little what religion the people may profess. Crime, misery and wretchedness will be their lot, while the fortunate landholder will subscribe to churches, go to meeting, give alms to the Bible societies, and talk of "law and order," of vested rights and civilization, just as they have done in England for the hundreds of years that have passed since Latimer wrote.

Our present force of government officials could be retained and additions made to it, which the reader will have observed we made a provision for, to the extent of sixty millions a year for each of the first five years, and eighty millions for each of the five of the second payment. It would be the duty of these officials to see that the tax was paid, and to see that no man was occupying more land than he had a right to, to the detriment of some one else's right.

And, also, could it be made a part of their duty to determine if, and how much of, the tax should be remitted in case of disaster to the land or the occupant.

All cases of dispute that might arise under the first operation of the law could be taken for adjudication to the county courts, and appeal allowed to the Judge of the Uni-

ted States Court of the District. For as there would be no litigation arising from, and in consequence of, ownership of land, no suits for rents from one individual to another, the present duties of our courts would be greatly diminished. And suits from other causes, too numerous to mention, would also cease to exist; for all law suits of a civil nature, now in existence, can be traced to the operation of the present recognized right of land ownership.

Regarding the questions of security of property, and the effect upon improvements which will arise when this proposition is first broached, we can do no better than quote the following extract from Mr. Henry George's work, *Progress and Poverty:*

"Among us nothing is more common than for land to be improved by those who do not own it. The greater part of the land of Great Britain is cultivated by tenants, the greater part of the buildings of London are built upon leased ground, and even in the United States the same system prevails everywhere to a greater or less extent. Thus it is a common matter for use to be separated from ownership. Would not all this land be cultivated and improved just as well if the rent went to the State or municipality, as now, when it goes to private individuals? If no private ownership in land were acknowledged but all land were held in this way, the occupant or user paying rent to the State, would not land be used and improved as well and securely as now? There can be but one answer: Of course it would. Then, would the resumption of land, as common property, in no wise interfere with the proper use and improvement in land?

What is necessary for the improvement of land is not its private ownership, but the security of improvements. It is not necessary to say to a man, the land is yours, in order to induce him to improve it. It is only necessary to say to him, whatever your labor or capital produces on this land is

yours. Give a man security that he will reap and he will sow; assure him of the possession of the house he wants to build and he will build it. These are the natural rewards of labor. It is for the sake of the reaping that men sow. It is for the sake of possessing houses that men build—the ownership of land has nothing to do with it. It was for the sake of obtaining this security that in the beginning of the feudal system period, so many of the smaller land owners surrendered the ownership of their lands to a military chieftain, retaining back the use of them in fief or trust, and kneeling bareheaded before the lord, with their hands between his hands, swore to serve him with life and limb and worldly honor; similar instances of giving up of ownership of land for the sake of security in its enjoyment are to be seen in Turkey where a peculiar exemption from taxation and extortion attaches to "Vakouf," or church lands, and where it is a common thing for a land owner to sell his land to a mosque for a nominal price, with the understanding that he may remain as tenant upon it at a fixed rent. 'It is not the magic of property,' as Arthur Young said, 'that has turned Flemish lands into fruitful fields, it is the magic of security to labor.

"This can be secured in other ways than making land private property. * * * * The mere pledge of an Irish landlord that for twenty years he would not claim, in rent, any share in their cultivation, induced Irish peasants to turn a barren mountain into gardens. On the mere security of a fixed ground-rent for a term of years, the most costly buildings of such cities as London and New York are erected on leased ground. If we give improvement such security we may safely abolish private property in land. The complete recognition of common rights to land need in no way interfere with the complete recognition of individual right to improvements or produce. Two men may own a ship without sawing her in half. The ownership of a railway may be divided into a hundred thousand shares, and yet trains be run with as much system and precision as if there were but a single owner. In London joint stock companies

have been formed to hold and manage real estate. Everything could go on as now, and yet the common right to land be fully recognized by appropriating rent to the common benefit.

There is a lot in the centre of San Francisco to which the common rights of the people of that city are yet legally recognized. This lot is not cut up into infinitesimally small pieces, nor yet is it an unused waste. It is covered with fine buildings, the property of private individuals, that stand there in perfect security; the only difference between this lot and those around it is that the rent of the one goes into the common school fund, the rent of the others into private pockets. What is to prevent the land of a whole people being held by the people of the country in this way? * * * * So far from the recognition of private property being necessary to the proper use of land, the contrary is the case. Treating land as private property stands in the way of its proper use. Were land treated as public property it would be used and improved as soon as there was need for its use or improvement, but being treated as private property the individual owner is permitted to prevent others from using or improving what he cannot or will not use or improve himself. When the title is in dispute the most valuable land lies unimproved for years. In many parts of England improvement is stopped because the estates being entailed no security to improvement can be given, and large tracts of ground, which were treated as public property, would be covered with buildings and crops.

In the thickly settled parts of the United States there is enough land to maintain three or four times our present population, lying unused because its owners are holding it for higher prices, and immigrants are forced past this unused land to seek homes where their labor will be far less productive. In every city valuable lots may be seen lying vacant for the same reason. If the best use of land be the test, then private property in land is condemned as it is condemned by every other consideration."

The only security that land-owners and property-holders now have is the security that the law affords; and law is operative to produce security only in proportion as the dictates of the law coincide with the sentiments of a community or nation; therefore, under the plan proposed, the law would be as effective to secure a *right conceded by all, as now it is to secure a possession contested by many.* In the last analysis, law has no force other than that derived from the consent of the people. How very much more secure, then, will property be when the dicta of the law coincides with the interests of all the people.

It may be asked, suppose that a man, after using land should, because of bad crops or through other misfortunes, be unable to meet his government rent? It may be asked in reply, what does the tenant under existing regulations do under the same circumstances? He borrows money to pay it, or moves; with this difference, that his rent, at present, is about double or treble what the government rent would be, and if forced to sell, or desirous of selling his improvements, he could secure a better price; for competition for purchase of improvements, everything else being equal, will be great as land is low in value; under the present system, if he is forced to sell out, he could only get what his merchant or mortgagor or some speculator would be willing to give; and in every instance they would give less than the actual worth of his improvement. In fact, the purchase would be narrowed down to the owner of the land, and he would give what he chose, for no one will pay full price for improvements that is on land that belongs to some one else. And this tenant, when he sought other land, would still have to pay a rent for the use of it. He would have the same security that he now has, only with a much greater chance of being able to pay his rent.

But, there is no reason why we, in the nineteenth century, cannot be as just and politic as the Peruvians were five hundred, or the Egyptians were four thousand years ago. And both of these people foresaw calamities and misfortunes and had the wisdom and humanity to provide against them.

We have mentioned that it could easily be a part of the government official's duty to determine if an allowance in part or a remittal of the whole tax should not, under certain circumstances, be made. Eventually the tax would be so light as not to require that any provisions need be made for this end.

As to the man that had heretofore owned lands, while it is true, that should he desire to move he could not sell his land, it must be remembered that he had already sold and obtained the cash for it, and that he could move and secure another place if he desired, and would not have to pay anything for this new place except the government tax. This plan would be, not only much more simple than that embraced in the late Land Reform Bill just passed by the English Government, but far more effective to produce present good, and permanent good.

This new land law provides that a tenant may buy his holding from his landlord, if he can pay down one-fourth, the government lending him the rest; and this one-fourth he is allowed to raise by mortgaging the farm if he desires. For it is certain that, if the peasants of Ireland avail themselves of this offer of the English Government, in the course of a few years they would become more embarrassed, and would have to sell this land to satisfy the government or private claims. Thus the system which has produced such direful results in the past, large estate ownership, would, by

the very operation of this new land law, be again reinstated. *This has been the case in the past with every effort made to overcome this evil, when the remedy was based upon giving the peasant or small proprietor the ownership of the land.* Not otherwise can mortgages and encumbrances be avoided that will eventually make a transfer of the land to liquidate indebtedness necessary.

Now as regards the feasibility of this idea, it may be presumed, as far as the poor of the country are concerned, they will be willing, and these will embrace not only all small farmers now embarrassed, and tenants and laborers, but our mechanics and the young of our cities. But it is more than probable that our landlords, those who own large bodies of land would be willing that some such measure be adopted. We are satisfied that a full and free discussion of the subject would show them the advantages to be derived by all from this measure, and that they would be willing to sell out those large bodies of land, which, in the majority of cases are unremunerative to work and expensive to hold. We heard one planter in Mississippi say that he had twenty-two hundred acres of land that was worth twenty-five dollars an acre, but which he would sell to any purchaser who would take *the whole* and *pay cash* at fifteen dollars per acre; this plantation is situated in Washington county, the richness of whose soil cannot be surpassed by any land in the world. This planter said that he had lost ninety thousand dollars in one year raising cotton, and while it was true that in the long run he made not only a good living, but some money over and above expenses, how much more easily could he have accomplished a greater result for himself, and how many enterprises could he have initiated and carried forward if he had had the price of this land in his pocket?

And the negroes who now pay him from eight to ten dollars an acre in rents for the privilege of using this land, would be able to get the same land from the government at three dollars, and they would in ten years be in command of a competency through difference of rents alone.

To return to the gain that would follow to the tenants, not only would they make for themselves the difference between the government rent and the rent they now pay, but they would make each succeeding year more, for if the land remains private property and the country becomes settled, the rents would be raised from year to year.

And still we have not shown all that they would gain by the change. They would save the difference between the *cash* prices they would pay for supplies they have to buy and the "*time*" prices they now pay; which would average a gain of about thirty-three and one-third per cent on their expenditures during the year. For with their late landlord, and hundreds of others having a surplus of cash on hand, that they had obtained by the sale of their land, money would seek investments in loans to the small farmers, and with money so borrowed he could pay cash for those supplies needed.

For, under existing conditions, it is a necessity forced upon the dealer to charge a large margin of profit on the goods he has to furnish on time. If he did not he would soon become bankrupt himself, for he must charge enough on three articles sold on credit to cover the very probable loss of one of the three and still allow a margin of gain on the other two.

At present, in the South, and elsewhere we presume, there are thousands of dealers who, with small capital have to sell a great many goods on credit. To enable them to do this, each

dealer must buy on time, say four months, and then settle by note due in the crop season, generally six months more, and thus he pays a higher price in the first place than he would have to do if he paid cash, and in addition has to pay interest on his note. Consequently, when they sell, all this has to be counted in and added to the probable amount of loss he will sustain by bad debts during the year. And thus those farmers who do manage to pay their debts have to pay the losses of those who fail to do so; beside the interest and increased cost incurred by the merchant buying on time, and beside all this, a legitimate profit on such goods as they get.

Thus a plow that the dealer can get from the manufacturer for $3.75 cash he has to pay $4.00 for on ninety days or four months time—and if the small merchant wants accommodation, he is charged the highest legal rate of interest from the time the note is made until paid. Therefore what he could buy for $3.75 cash, in reality costs him $3.75 *and* 25 cents *and* the interest on $4.00 for four or five months. Now in selling this plow, if the dealer can sell it for cash, as there is no risk of loss, no time to be asked, he can and generally does sell it low, say for $4.75 or $5.00 But if a tenant or farmer buys this plow on credit, he cannot get it for less than the cash price $4.75 *plus* the addition for time 25 cents, *plus* the interest 3 cents, *plus* the estimated risk of probable loss on whole amount of plows sold during the season. In different localities, and with different trades, this estimate will vary, but generally, and as a rule, one-third of the cash selling price will be added, hence the farmer or tenant who buys on long time will pay for this plow from $6.50 to $7.00. And this difference holds good through the whole list of articles that a farmer will need during the year. Estimating that a single man working fifty acres of land will require

goods, in provisions, stock and utensils, to the value of $300 a year, we can easily form an approximate idea of what he would gain by the new conditions, over what he can make under present circumstances. At present he would pay a rent, that on the average, would be about $7.00 per acre, or for fifty acres $350. Now as we have shown that he would have to pay, say, lowest estimate, $6.50 for a plow which, if bought for cash he could get for $4.75, what he would have to pay for goods that would be sold him for $300, will be to $300 as $6.50 is to $4.75, that is a little more than $410.

The value of the produce of this land being placed at $15.50 per acre, the result of labor as applied to farming as a tenant of an individual may be summed up thus:

50 acres yielding of produce, in value, ...		$775 00
EXPENSES.		
Rent of 50 acres @ $7.00 per acre, . . .	$350 00	
Am't. paid for provisions bought on time,	410 00	
Taxes direct and indirect, ...	5 00	765 00
Total gain for the year's labor, ...		$10 00

Under the conditions proposed the result would be as follows:

50 acres yielding of produce, in value, ...		$775 00
EXPENSES.		
Rent to government @ $3.00 per acre, . .	$150 00	
Interest on $300 borrowed @ 10 per cent, .	30 00	
Goods bought with $300, ...	300 00	
Taxes direct and indirect, ...	5 00	485 00
Total gain for year's labor, ...		$290 00

In the one case the laborer would have made $10.00 by his year's work, and this in all probability he would spend for

whisky, for depression of spirits and despair are great causes of indulgence in intoxicating drinks, and in all probability he would quit working on a farm and become a tramp, and the country would not only have lost a citizen, but would have gained a vagabond or a criminal, both of whom breed expenses that have to be paid by the honest and industrious.

In the other case he would have made $290, and in a few years would have $500 or $600, would marry and become a useful citizen and a virtuous man.

Agreeing that for all practical purposes the figures given are correct, and remembering that we have estimated the number of farmers in the country at 5,000,000, each using fifty acres of land, the gain of the farmers would be five million times the gain of one, ($290) that is to say, $1,450,000,000 a year.* For while all farmers do not buy on credit nor rent land, the figures are made with due allowance for such exceptions.

This payment of cash by the farmer for his goods would enable the small dealer to pay cash for his purchases from

*This rough and approximate calculation will enable us to see how near right Mr. Turner, of Kentucky, was when in Congress he said that "by our present system of protection the people paid to the monopolists of this country $2,000,000 over and above the costs of the articles they had to purchase. An amount which, if applied to the purchase of the lands, would pay for them in ten years, estimating their value at twenty billions.

"Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at this question calmly and impartially. What is the total value of the commodities imported into the United States from foreign countries upon which a tariff duty is imposed? It is $448,061,587,95. What is the total amount of tariff duty imposed upon that amount by the Morrill tariff—the one now in force? One hundred and ninety-three millions eight hundred thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven dollars and sixty-seven cents, which is an average of

the jobber, and similarly the jobber could pay cash for his supplies from the manufacturer, and thus all classes of business would prosper, for all sales would be made on a cash basis, and the element of risk and loss being eliminated, the goods could be bought and sold cheaper by all.

There are many fallacious notions afloat about jobbers and middle men, but all middle men are the result of a demand for their services, As long as private ownership of land forces immigration to the outer edges of civilization, middle men are a benefit, as they secure cheaper freights than could be obtained by individuals. A farmer living five, ten or twenty miles from Racine, Wis., can go to the factory and buy a wagon for sixty dollars. Now, the same wagon cannot be sold at Fort Smith, Ark., for less than $75. The jobber must have $3.00, the railroads must have $7.00 and the retailer must have $5.00; but if there were no jobber or retailer and the farmer had to purchase direct, he would have to pay the railroad $15.00 for freights alone, and not be able to get a single wagon in as good condition as if shipped by car load, and, too, he would have to pay cash, whereas his

43¼ per cent. What is the total amount of goods consumed in the United States upon which a tariff duty is collected? According to the census of 1870, it was $4,000,000,000. I could not procure from the Census office the exact amount now, as the tables are not completed, but, according to the ratio of increase, it is about five billion dollars. Now, reducing the average duty to forty per cent., which is more than a fair calculation, it makes the amount of enhanced value by reason of the tariff duties imposed, $2,000,000,000, which is a bonus. Thus it will be seen that the manufacturers receive the enormous bonus of $2,000,000,000, so that the consumers pay annually into the Treasury $193,800,898,68 collected under the tariff, and pay a bonus to the manufacturers of $2,000,000,000 in addition, thus showing that for every dollar collected under the tariff which goes into the Treasury ten dollars go into the pockets of the manufacturers."

dealer often buys for him and waits until the harvest for his money.

As political economy is at present understood, business men occupy themselves with solving the problems of commerce by studying how to make factories lower their prices, how to make railroads lower their charges, and dealers are eternally cutting against each other, and growling about prices and freights. And all this is called being practical.

If Jones, who wants a wagon at Fort Smith, had been allowed the chance to settle in Indiana, he could have purchased his wagon at sixty dollars, but not being able to buy land there he goes West where it is cheaper, and is kept poor all his life paying railroads to haul him his wagons, etc., and merchants to handle them for him. It is true that every one cannot live within twenty miles of a factory, but population will soon bring factories to it, and a dense population produces low freights. Were land free nearly all purchases could be made direct from manufacturers.

And thus, while at first sight the proposition to increase our indebtedness $24,000,000,000 will seem wild and visionary to our capitalists, it may not seem so wild and impracticable if we examine the matter closely. Estimating that out of the 50,000,000 inhabitants of the United States, 8,000,000 are interested as workers one way or another in the cheapness, or rather the freeing, of the land, we have only as each man's share of this enormous amount some $3,000, and to pay this he is given fifty years. That is $60 a year, or $5 a month.

Fifty years not only without interest but with great gain over the cost that the present system entails; and then no rent at all, and only a tax so slight as to be insignificant. In place of dealing with millions and billions, if we will re-

duce the figures and say that eight men, who have been paying a monthly rent of seven dollars each on 250 buildings, worth $24,000, had this property offered them on a monthly payment of $3.00 each, said payments to be credited as purchase money, and when the $24,000 had been paid up the property would be theirs, with no other charges than may be necessitated for keeping the same in good order, we could readily see the great inducement to close with such a proposition. Instead of paying as before $7.00 on each of the 250 buildings as rent, which, as time went on, would not decrease the necessity for further payment, but would, by increasing demand for buildings, increase the price steadily, now they would only pay $3.00 per month on each of the buildings, and in less than three years they would own the buildings, and never more would have to pay rent at all.

And to show that Capital is as much interested in accomplishing the freeing of land as Labor is, it is only necessary to remind the capitalist of the fact that, under the operation of the present system of political economy, founded upon individual ownership of land, in proportion as a country advances in age and wealth, in population and civilization, not only do wages for labor become less and less, but interest on money declines, and profits on merchandise become smaller and smaller, while land values steadily increase. That is, land absorbs, by constantly increasing value, the great bulk of the results of labor and enterprise. Does an enterprising merchant locate a store or build a warehouse, or a manufacturer a factory? The influx of people, mechanics, small dealers, etc., with their wives and families quickly raises the rent of the land which in that proportion reduces his profits and their balances.

Another fact which would follow upon our proposed plan

which, if properly and persistently presented to the manufacturers of our country, would convince them that their interest in this matter is with the working man and the capitalist, is, that as affairs now are, the tendency for great wealth to accumulate in the hands of a few, creates a demand by these few for foreign products; such as the finer laces, silks, diamonds, etc. Thus, manufacturers of iron goods and farm implements, and, in fact, all American industries, reap advantage from the increase of wealth, as it *now increases* in an inverse ratio to the amount of this increase.[aa] Our nabobs spend millions on diamonds, silks, cashmere shawls, laces, foreign wines, cigars and bric-a-brac, where they spend hundreds on articles of home production; and the evil does not end here. Each millionaire has a circle, who in their expenses endeavor to follow his example in these matters as far as they are able; the constant tendency being to throw in the direction of foreign goods all the increase of wealth. On the other hand, the people not partaking of this increase of wealth are the customers of American manufacturers, and this custom is becoming more and more circumscribed. The customers are becoming poorer and poorer; hence, when a drouth, or a flood, or grasshoppers, injure the crops, the people having nothing except what was in the crop, are unable to purchase, and consequently the manufacturers find an unsatisfactory market for their goods. If we reverse the process

[aa] The last report of the Secretary of the Treasury shows an extravagance, on our part, never equaled even in the flush days of inflation which followed the financial derangement caused by the war. In the past fiscal year we purchased $110,000,000 of such luxuries as silk, paintings, watches, etc., the result being a deficit of $10,610,936 in our trade sheets for July, or of $50,824,742 for the seven months ending on Aug. 1, '82. —*New Orleans Times, Sept.*, 1882.

and devise some means whereby the increase of wealth can be more uniformly distributed, it is very evident that the people will be enabled to lay up some money every year; hence, the demand being uniformly on the increase, manufacturers could rely on a steady market for their products.

And when the cause of the numerous and ever increasing evils that now afflict all classes of society shall have become more clearly recognized, the great Republic of the nineteenth century, will witness a combination that took place two thousand years ago in the troubles of another Republic yet greater than ours.[bb]

When the hour of struggle came, Crassus, the wealthiest capitalist in Rome, the representative of capital, did not unite his fortunes with that of the "conservative party of order."

No, it was with that destroyer of customs, that giant of Democracy, Julius Cæsar, "the noblest Roman of them all," that capital linked its fortunes; though against it was arrayed conservatism and talent, represented by Cicero; conservatism and mediocrity, represented by Pompey; conservatism, tradition and religion, represented by Cato, and threw itself on the side of justice and popular rights, Cæsar and genius, in the struggle with "vested rights, law and order."

And when a similar trial comes to America, liberty

[bb] "The third great power in Rome was that of the capitalists. * * * Crassus, the impersonation of them, was a friend of Cæsar, but had been on bad terms with Pompey. Cæsar, however, contrived to reconcile them, and thus all parties outside the patrician circle were combined for a common purpose. Could Cicero have taken his place frankly at their side, as his better knowledge told him to do, the inevitable revolution might have been accomplished without bloodshed and the course of history have been different."—*Cæsar. A Sketch—J. A. Froude.*

need have no fear of the result. The same cause will produce the same or dissimilar results as circumstances shall decide.

The popular outburst against landlords that took place in Rome changed a Republic into an Empire. The popular protest against the same evil that took place in France changed an Empire into a Republic, and when the people of the United States shall, by the same cause, be forced to speak, the result will be to make a government that was founded by the people, nominally for the people—one that shall be so constituted as to accomplish its originally designated purpose.

But of all capitalists, railroad men, perhaps, have a greater interest in this matter than any others. With the present disposition among the people to attribute their troubles to railroads, those having money at stake are liable at any moment to have such laws passed by the various State Legislatures as to seriously affect their interest. Mistaking the cause, but seeing themselves becoming poorer every day, the people will heap so many restrictions upon railroad traffic, will pass so many statutes regulating their charges, as really to take the virtual control of their property from the owners to turn it over to the tender mercies of the average legislator; and this legislator, in matters of this nature, is guided by the desires of his constituents, and these constituents, in the majority of cases, are the farmers—those, in a word, who, becoming poor by the injurious results that always follow to the majority from the action of law, when land is the subject of private ownership, trace all their troubles and growing poverty to railroads.

The result of erroneous systems of political economy, producing misery among the peasantry of Russia, they take

vengeance on the Jews, wrongly attributing to them their woes. In the United States the farmers suffering from the same cause, lay to the charge of railroads their troubles, and act accordingly. In the freeing of the land, the railroad magnates and stockholders may find the solution of their troubles.

A few years ago, when the government was paying seven and eight per cent. interest on its bonds, the people, becoming poorer by the operation of competition and a bad system of land tenure, thought that the hard times were due to this withdrawal of the vast amount of money necessary to pay interest on these bonds, from the labor of the people. Then the Republican party, under the guidance of Mr. Sherman, succeeded in having the public debt refunded at four per cent. This, considered a brilliant financiering feat, has ever since been claimed by the Republicans, one of the principal claims this party had to the control of the government. But, as showing conclusively that this vaunted measure was of no avail to cure the evils arising from modern civilization, while it was true that as soon as the great bulk of the money that had heretofore been loaned to the government had, by the reduction of interest, been thrown into other channels, a great activity took place in railroad building, the causes that produced distress in the first instance not being at all affected by the funding act, they soon began again to manifest themselves in financial troubles, in increase of competition, increase of pauperism, etc. Now, the sapient demagogues lay to the charge of railroads what they had before attributed to the heavy interest paid bondholders, and, in consequence, legislatures are taking action to cripple and harass railroad management to such a degree as to seriously imperil future enterprises of that character.

In Georgia the repressive and restrictive measures, after reducing passenger fares to three cents per mile, irrespective of distance, have touched lately upon baggage charges, and in consequence we find some railroads limiting the number of pounds they will carry for each passenger. All over 150 pounds on a first-class ticket has to be turned over to the Express company.

Surely the railroad men, above every other class of capitalists, are interested in obtaining a quick and clear answer to this problem of poverty. As long as they are placed between strikes on the one hand, demanding always more pay, and the people on the other, through their Legislatures, demanding always reduced rates of freight and passenger tariffs, what can they see ahead but a constant battle with labor, and the expenditure of large sums to prevent adverse action by Legislatures, and a general decrease of dividends? The railroad interest, next to the body of the people themselves, is, perhaps, of all classes, the one most interested in, and would be most profited by, free lands.

It may be asked, suppose the government should buy up the country lands, what action should be taken with that land which is embraced in the corporate limits of cities and towns? The proper thing to do, in our opinion, would be to buy this land also, paying as much per foot or lot as they were valued at by their owners in their returns to the tax collectors the year previous to the passage of the law authorizing their purchase. And a ground rent varying with the population of the town or city, be imposed on each lot or site occupied by a building.

This tax or ground rent to vary from ten dollars to fifty dollars according to population of the city.

The nicer adjustment of rent to value, could be left to be

regulated by each city for itself in imposing municipal taxation.

If rendered necessary by the increased amount of notes that would have to be issued to include all land, make these notes to run for seventy-five years instead of fifty, one-tenth payable every five years. But if this should be urged, the enormous debt that would be nominally laid upon the country, would dismay capitalists and others to such an extent as might make the plan impossible of execution, while if restrained to the country lands, while the debt would still be large, those who would bring themselves to investigate the matter would see that, large as it would be, it would only require the two elements of time and industry to discharge it. In our opinion the better plan, then, would be to buy only those lands not incorporated. The result would be, that with the exception, perhaps, of New York city, rents would have a constant tendency downward. For if land could be obtained at a ground rent of three dollars per acre, say within ten miles of Chicago, certainly all new business enterprises would locate within that distance rather than pay such enormous rentals as now rule in that city, and the town would gradually gravitate towards the new city. The advantages would draw first the new inhabitants, who could easily run into the old city by train to attend to business, then the small dealers would follow, thus a new city would grow up whose advantages would be such as to force rents in the old town to a minimum. Or, if this should not prove the case, new sites would be selected for the building of cities, and their growth would have the desired result. It might be well, however, to have the right reserved to the government to buy these city lots, say in twenty years if it should prove as easy a matter as we are convinced it would be to pay up,

that is, absorb by a ground rent, the amount paid for the country lands. It being provided that the amount paid, at the time settled upon by the government, should not exceed the assessed value of the same as rendered in the year of the passage of the act authorizing the purchase of the country lands.

If the measure suggested cannot be carried out except by a change in the Constitution, then by all means let the various States be canvassed in the interest of this purpose and let Conventions determine if the change can be made. Men who have the interest of their country at heart, men who care for the happiness of the people, men who desire to see virtue revived and religion become a fact and not a shadow, should satisfy themselves that some step like the one suggested should be taken, and then devote themselves to so noble a cause.

It may be said that it is all nonsense to talk of imposing a tax of three dollars per acre every year on each acre of occupied land, when there are millions of acres that can be bought for but a little more than this sum. But it must be remembered that to avail themselves of these low prices many sacrifices of friends and old associations have to be made, and in thousands of cases where disinclination from causes of this nature to go away so far for land may be overcome by resolution or necessity, the heads of families in thousands of instances cannot obtain the means to defray traveling expenses for themselves and wives and children, if they have any such distances to go, and to support them while *en route*, and maintain them until labor can produce returns from land.[cc]

[cc]How much inducement emigration to the far West presents to the ordinary man, may be inferred from the following:

"The mode of settlement and farming on the plains of Dakota is by

An honest *proletary* who should be seeking work that would enable him to support his wife and children with some degree of comfort and respectability, if he was in a city like New York, would listen with indifference, if he was without money, if told that he could enter a homestead in Oregon, or buy land in Minnesota or Kansas from some Railroad Company on partial payments, extending through a series of years. And this indifference would still characterize his attention if, supposing he had enough money to pay his and his family's expenses, he had not enough to purchase implements and provisions, seed, etc., when there. And this indifference would be changed to impatience and discontent in proportion as he will love and cherish those dependent on his daily labor, whom affection or duty have assigned to his care. Our present system is nicely calculated to make rioters, strikers and mobs out of the best material. The sot, the vagabond, the sloth, the thief, these do not concern themselves about such matters; our vicious population fare best in society as society is now constituted. It is the hard worker who makes no progress, the inventor, who is cheated out of his brain-work by capital, it is the men of good intentions, of sympathetic natures, the wife-lovers and the child-lovers, who are wrought to madness by the result of poverty, and of class distinctions that necessarily follow.

And it is because of this continual clashing of the rude reality with the ideals of a possible better system that has

no means the best to promote comfortable living or to develop a high type of character.

"It is the American system of isolated farm houses; drearily isolated, indeed, are the little bare dwellings that dot the wild prairies and rolling plateaux." "*The New Northwest.*" *E. V. Smalley in Century for August*, 1882.

produced among men of poetic temperament that proclivity to recklessness and extravagance of means and manner, to wine and gaming, that has in so many cases been characteristic of men of that nature.

But if the poor man could get land ten miles from New York, his past conduct and present intentions would insure him friends who would assist him. As for expenses of transportation, he could walk, and like the farmers used to do in the old days, his neighbors would soon see him in shape to begin work.[dd]

[dd]Even the poor Indians will do this much for strangers coming to live in their village and for each other. Says Parkman in his *Jesuits in North America:*

"All were prompt to aid each other in distress, and a neighborly spirit was often exhibited among them. When a young woman was permanently married, the other women of the village supplied her with firewood for the year, each contributing an armful. When one or more families were without shelter, the men of the village joined in building them a house. In return the recipients of the favor gave a feast, if they could, if not, their thanks were sufficient. Among the Iroquois and Hurons, and doubtless among the kindred tribes, there were marked distinctions of noble and base, prosperous and poor. Yet, while there was food in the village, the meanest and poorest need not suffer want. He had but to enter the nearest house, and seat himself by the fire, when without a word on either side, food was placed before him by the women."

The authorties given by Mr. Parkman for these details are Champlain, Sagard, Bressini and the *Jesuit Relations* prior to 1650; and continues our author in a foot note to p. 9–XLIX: "The following testimony concerning Indian charity and hospitality is from Ragueneau: 'As often as we have seen tribes broken up, towns destroyed, and their people driven to flight, we have seen them to the number of seven or eight hundred persons received with open arms by charitable hosts, who gladly gave them aid, and even distributed among them a part of the lands already planted, that they might have the means of living.' *Jesuit Relations*, 1650, 28. It may be remarked in passing, that among these tribes "there was no individual ownership of land, but each family had for the time exclusive right to as much as it saw fit to cultivate."

A cabin would soon be erected, seed loaned and implements also, and those loved ones who are at present a drag, as well as often they now are an agony, would be either his cheerful and bright assistants, or his security for the obligations friendship or interest may have imposed.

And this ability to go to farming without having to go to the ends of the world for a farm, would induce thousands besides our *proletary* to do the same thing. And with the absence of so many from the battle-field of competition, the rise of wages that would follow would enable those who remained to select that work in which they took most interest; and thus they who remained and those who went, would all be happy, *interested* beings, all contributing by their work to the benefit of all.

And yet the rise of wages would be but little over present prices. The content that would follow, would not be due to this cause particularly, but to the precious consciousness every man would have, that if he desired to, he could at any time quit working for wages and go to farming for himself. The strain would be removed under which the poor and landless now exist.

The rise of wages would be but little in actual dollars and cents, but the increase of farmers would make provisions cheaper, and thus a dollar of the mechanic could buy more of bread and meat and vegetables than before; and the farmer, too, would get a greater profit, despite the lower price of provisions; where he would gain would be in increase of customers, and in rent and a handy market. And what little advance prices would make would not injure the manufacturer. The gain, in certainty of payment for all he would manufacture and sell, would be enough to pay the advance in wages. Nearly all manufacturers allow from five to ten

per cent. in estimating loss by sales. In other words they charge from five to ten per cent. in selling their goods to allow for the five or ten per cent. loss, that experience tells them is apt to occur in a large business. The farmer would gain by the elimination of this element of cost from the price of goods when made by the country dealer, the city merchant or the jobber, and the mechanic, would make by the elimination of this estimate by the manufacturer. The only class who would lose would be the speculators—the men who manipulate "futures" and get up "corners", and their loss would be the country's great and eternal gain.

Then, again, it must be borne in mind, in estimating the the value of the land upon which this tax of $3.00 would be levied, that the fifty acres, or the one hundred acres, that one could occupy under the new order of affairs, as proposed, in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, or Illinois, would not only be more valuable because of social considerations, such as advantages of schools, good society, security, accessibilty to theatres, lecture rooms, music halls, churches, etc., and as being less expensive to reach, but, because of the density of population, mechanics, merchants, students, etc., then, there would be a greater and more varied demand for the produce of the field, the garden and the hot-house, and thus this land would be far more valuable with the tax, than any land that can now be bought at six, eight or ten dollars an acre and no rent. And if bought at these last named prices, by the time the growth of population would make them even approximate in value, each acre would have absorbed in labor, time and money, far more than the proposed tax, and by that time, too, the land debt would have been liquidated by absorption, and there would be no

tax on land except a small sum to defray the expenses of government.

And if, perchance, one could not get the fifty or one hundred acres in any of the States named, it could only occur because others had anticipated him, in which event the farms or land that he *could get next to these farms would be just as valuable and just as desirable.*

We venture the assertion, that if this or some similar plan would be adopted, in thirty-five years not only would the land debt be blotted out, but that our national war debt would also be extinguished, and the government could be carried on, on a most liberal scale, by the imposition of an annual tax of only fifty cents an acre of land. States and counties could raise enough to defray all their expenses and provide free schools all over the country, by an additional tax of $1.00 an acre. And revenues from any other source would not be needed, therefore, internal revenue taxation and duties on imports could alike follow in the paths of the other "relics of barbarism."

For, in twenty-five years, this country, under these favorable conditions, would certainly maintain the ratio of progress she has maintained in the past, would in fact double her population. There would be then 100,000,000 of souls in our country in twenty-five years more; and estimating the number of farmers at one-fifth, would give us 20,000,000, using and paying taxes on fifty acres of land each. 1,000,000,000 acres of land, at fifty cents an acre, would give us a government revenue of $500,000,000; more than enough, under circumstances as they would then exist, to defray all our national expenses on a most generous scale.

Of course it will be urged as an objection to the idea insisted upon, of buying up the land, that the flooding of the

country with so much paper money would demoralize industrious habits and check commerce and manufacturing.

It is only necessary in answer to the first of these predicted results to ask why do men work under existing circumstances? From two causes principally, though a third cause could be offered in accounting for work, that restless desire to be doing something which impels thousands, though rich, to continue amassing wealth, which keeps the philosopher, independent in many cases of this world's wants, busied in studies and investigations, in travels and expeditions in order to effect something; and which makes the convict in his cell pass months and years whittling toys, carving curiosities, or making models. The two principal causes, however, referred to are the evils that result if men do not work, and the rewards that attend labor. The desire to better their condition is the cause of work with the mass of men. And if some method be adopted that will give every man access to land, and will guarantee to him the fruits of labor, so far from demoralizing industry, it will only accent and strengthen the desire to work. If commerce should suffer, so much the worse for commerce, but a bushel of corn would still be a bushel of corn, and a side of bacon or a shoulder of beef would still be desirable articles of food; and commerce could adjust itself to the change or not, as commercial men may decide, but the lesser industry must adapt itself to the greater, and it would.

Commerce is a result of prosperity and not the ultimate cause. In the last analysis all forms of industry depend for sustenance upon *land*, and labor as applied to land, and if our political economist shall find the correct system by which labor and land can be free to unite, commerce, manufactures, art and science all will follow naturally. That

a man should be able to leap three feet with his legs bound is no argument why we should not unbind them if jumping is the end desired.[ee] Or, if some men had been able to to get great wealth in Rome, that is no reason that we should adopt the Roman system of political economy. Untie the man's legs and he will jump ten feet. Give Rome a better political economy and fifty men would have obtained competency where one did before.

Then, let it be observed, how great the gain of society would be in the matter of alms. For, under the proposed conditions there would be no necessity for those vast amounts which are daily and yearly given by the good and the thoughtless in the vain endeavor to fill a bottomless pit. Enable labor to reap the reward of its toil and men will not beg. It will not only be more honorable to work, but far more remunerative—policy, as well as pride, would make men work; for labor, like any other force, will take the line of least resistance. If hard work, under present conditions is followed with meagre rewards, it is natural that men adopt professions that will obtain them greater reward with less labor. If it becomes a question whether one will labor at work uncongenial and irksome, for fifty cents a day, or become a gambler, where, with less work he may make five dollars a day, or a beggar and make the same fifty cents, with great

[ee]Some observers. Mr. Mallock for instance, view the matter thus: A child cannot jump a foot, a bound man can (if not bound too tightly) jump say, three feet, hence the thongs are the cause of the difference—hence, respect the thongs. This is just what it comes to when he says, in effect, "Society is in its structure as are its institutions. We in England and America can, commercially, and otherwise, jump further than natives of New Guinea. Now we have some institutions which they have not, therefore, the cause of our superiority is to be found in those institutions, therefore, adhere to them always and forever."

masses of men the amount of the reward, and the nature of the work, will make them decide in a manner injurious to the interest of society. But, where the reward of labor is at all equal to the reward of crime or shame, the moral nature of man and the opinion of society will always throw the scale on the side of honest labor.

When Alexander was in Asia and heard Aristotle had published some treatise, he wrote to him the following letter:

"Alexander to Aristotle, greeting: You have not done well to publish your books of oral doctrine, for what is there now that we excel others in, if those things which we have been particularly instructed in, be laid open to all?" (*Plutarch.*)

And the desire manifested by Alexander to retain the advantage that was to be derived from knowledge to a select few, was not confined to him alone, but was also the desire of many others in more recent times, and was one of the causes of the exclusion of the masses from access to education. But how groundless were the fears of all who entertained this idea, that the diffusion of education would lessen the value of knowledge, or deprive of their prestige the educated few.

John Richard Green, in his *History of the English People*, writing of the American Colonies and their first troubles with England, says:

"And behind all these grievances lay an uneasy sense of dread at the democratic form the government and society of the colonies had taken. The governors sent from England wrote back words of honest surprise and terror of the levelling principles of the men about them."

Yet, we know that it was in consequence of these "levelling principles," that the colonies became as great as they

did, and that any in the United States who would protest against these "levelling principles" now, would be deemed an enemy to his country.

So, too, when the cry shall be raised by interested parties, that in the plan proposed for the freeing of the lands, they see the cloven hoof of Communism, and detect the seeds of a "levelling principle," they may take warning that their hue and cry is as little apt to be verified, or will be as little able to stem the current of progress in the matter of placing every man in a position to secure competence, as formerly the same prophesies and the same dread was able to prevent the diffusion of education and the growth of Democracy. On the contrary, they should be able to see, that as knowledge has been potent for good, only in proportion as the people, by education, have been able to understand the arguments of the wise; that, as the free ballot has been a benefit, only as the diffusion of a political education has rendered the choice of the majority less liable to fall on an imbecile or a rascal, so the full benefits of wealth will only be obtained by a nation, when the general possession of a competency by all shall render the pernicious use of great wealth by a few impossible. With all independent in circumstances, with education general,and a free ballot, the patriotism and the sense of honor of the people will be free to aspire after and covet good, for then the line of least resistance will be upward, and the natural impulses of man will not be distorted from that heavenly direction by any of the evil forces that follow from ignorance, bad government, or poverty.

For, as Plutarch most wisely said, "Man is by nature not a wild or unsocial creature, neither was he born so, but makes himself what he naturally is not, by vicious habit."

And under the conditions mentioned, no vicious habits

can be formed. For it is by the combination of these factors in any considerable number of the people of a community that a force of virtuous public opinion is formed; and under the conditions proposed this public opinion will be so general, and at the same time so powerful, that even those few who do not at first follow virtue, for its own sake and by their own voluntary choice, will be constrained to affect it; then will the era of the "poetry of wealth" written of by Mr. J. R. Green as a dim dream, become a reality.

And again, as in spite of the diffusion of knowledge there is always a residuum of ignorance, as in spite of the free ballot there are always citizens who do not desire to become officers of government, so, too, with all our efforts to secure universal competence, there will always remain enough who, by defective education, or by inherited instinct, will remain to perform the more menial employments, and fill the ranks of hirelings. And we may rest assured that the gradings of society will for long continue the same as now, only those who are carpenters then, or waiters, or cooks, or blacksmiths, will be so because their education permits them not to aspire higher, or they are so by choice, and not as now by force of circumstances, which not only makes them miserable, reckless and flippant while filling their present positions, but from inclination to be something else, forever precludes the possibility of their ever attaining excellence in their several vocations. We may doctor man into health, but if we can remove all pernicious influences, he will naturally attain a health we could not by art possibly secure.

In this chapter we are aware that much that has been written is crude, and lacks finish both in presentation of the subject, and in the arguments and illustrations by which they are supported; but it is not supposed that the ideas

herein suggested will be accepted as they are given. It will be enough if there is sufficient of truth in the fundamental proposition here advanced to awaken the attention of others who will be more competent to determine more desirable and more practicable means of accomplishing that which we have so feebly attempted to show is so necessary to be accomplished.

In the course of our inquiry into the causes that produced unhappiness among men, we have found, among others, that exclusion from land, the recognition of the rights of individuals to land, is one of the most potent. And we have attacked this cause of evil with the same disinterested spirit with which we attacked and pointed out the influence of bad government and ignorance to produce the same result. In the same spirit of disregard for existing opinions that enabled us to show the fallacy of the old idea that death is because of sin, and which idea and opinion it was only necessary to notice because of the unhappiness the acceptance of this idea has caused, and with thousands still produces.

Being the owners of land ourselves, and our fathers having been land-owners before us for three generations, certainly by all laws of association of ideas, our sympathies should be with the land-holding class, and we can hardly be regarded, as Mr. Black terms Mr. Ingersoll, a "predetermined opponent" to existing systems of land laws. But, on the contrary, in this matter, our sympathies are all with the people.

While, in our opinion, the plan that has been suggested is entirely practicable and could readily be adopted and carried to a successful completion, without even temporary embarrassment to the business or prosperity of the country, and with the most beneficent, magnificent results, we cannot disguise the fact from ourselves that it is so comprehensive, so

gigantic, that so-called "practical" men will shrink from its advocacy, and doubtless will combat its acceptation. Therefore, while declaring this first plan to be the best which would, in the shortest time, produce the desired result, the knowledge that some other plan, less direct and comprehensive, but having the same end in view, would be more apt to secure adherents and champions, induces us to offer another for the consideration of the people.

And this plan is that the government, in the first place, hold, with a bull-dog's grip, every inch of land that it now possesses. Secondly, that it should institute such legal measures as may be necessary to repossess all land that has been given to railroads upon conditions that these railroads have not complied with. Thirdly, to buy all the lands within her borders that may be now on the market, including those paradises offered by railroads, and all other lands that private individuals would be willing to dispose of. Fourthly, to pass a law that hereafter no selling of lands would be allowed, except such as should be sold to the government. If A. wanted a piece of land that B. owned, and if A. was willing to pay B. his price, and B. was willing to sell at that price, that B. must sell to the government, and A. could obtain possession by paying the government a rent, to be determined by the government.

All the lands by any or all of these measures obtained to be offered to immigrants at a rental that may be determined upon by the Land Department, to be constituted for that purpose, adopting the rule that no single man could rent or occupy more than a certain number of acres, and a married man no more than a certain number of acres.

If the fourth proposition should conflict too much with our idea of the rights of individuals, in place of it, after having

reclaimed all land justly hers, after buying all that would be offered by individuals, let it be made known that all farms that should hereafter be offered for sale, offered either by choice, or that are ordered sold by decree of court, will be bid for by the government. Let these lands be bid for by officials appointed for that purpose, or the government could authorize any post-master, justice of the peace, or other State or county officers, to act for it. Let these bid as representatives of the government on all farms or unimproved lands that should be thrown upon the market either because of the misfortunes or the improvidence of the owner, or through the greed or the necessities of his creditors. By this means those farms, which through the indigence of their owners, are now swiftly passing into the possession of merchants, manufacturers, and speculators, would pass into possession of the people.

But it will be said, what is this but to place the government in this matter in competition with the people, with private enterprise, and to enhance the price of lands in many cases nearly worthless? Regarding the throttling of private enterprise, the purpose and endeavor of half of this book has been to show that that is just the desirable thing to do, when private enterprise takes the form of land purchases. Regarding the enhancing of prices, we say, that suppose the government by entering the market against a speculator or mortgagee should enhance the price of land, this advance would only be an advance over a speculator's or mortgagee's price. And as prices offered by these parties are universally below actual worth of the land, even at a little advance the government would be obtaining possession at a low valuation.

For, as the fact of bidding, does not necessitate purchase,

after a reasonable price had been offered by the government, if a speculator, or others, interested in advancing the price too high, should bid over the government, the government could quietly let the speculator, mortgager, or other interested party, have it.

But admitting that the government should in every case pay a dollar or two an acre more than an individual would, what would we lose? Nothing. The lands that the government would thus purchase, would be lands that were being sold out at sheriff's sale, or that farmers who had not succeeded in making farming profitable, would be selling so that they may try again in some other section. And we all know at what a sacrifice lands sold under these conditions are disposed of. Whereas, if the government should, by its competition run up the price, this increase of value would in the one case, enable a man to pay his debts and have a surplus; and in the other, to have a better start in the country he proposed to go to. This ability to realize enough by sale of land to pay his debts, if all other methods should fail, would make the merchant safe in his advances, and therefore he could sell cheaper.

Commercial transactions through all its stages, from retailer to consumer, from merchant to retailer, manufacturer to merchant, would be on a much cheaper scale since the element of risk on time sales to men with land, but little cash, would be eliminated. And, consequently, the competition to sell such a customer would make the farmer with land a large gainer in his income. And should the farmer at last be sold out he could, by the payment of less rent than he could get land for from an individual, immediately settle down in the same place a tenant of the government; and as far as this farm or land was concerned there would be

no more enhancing of values, no mortgages or sales. The farm would not, as now, pass into the possession of some one with a little money in hand who, without competition, could buy it at a nominal value and rent it to some poor devil who would have to pay him his price, or who, if that price could not be obtained, could hold it unimproved as long as he liked, and force immigration from the country. By the proposed plan every time a farm was sold, we would do that much towards satisfactorily and forever settling a correct basis upon which to develop virtue, happiness and prosperity. As now, every time a farm is sold we root up a family and force it to become strangers in a strange land, often without the means of support; and we enable some man who may be the most worthless of men, to get rich and become an aristocrat by possession of land; and we continue a system that, unless remedied, is sure to bring disaster upon the country as it has already brought trouble and unhappiness, complications and vice.

In such cases that might arise where there was no competitor to bid against it, the government could assess a righteous price by comparing original cost with tax returns, or by any other means that would be just to both parties. Regarding those farms with improvements in the way of houses, barns, fences, etc., if these by their value caused complications difficult to be avoided, the government could refrain from buying them at all. But in the majority of cases these improvements are of slight importance, and cut little if any figure in a forced sale, and in the South especially would not, in thousands of instances, be taken into consideration in estimating the value of the place. A log cabin, a few rails, and an ash-hopper, constituting in the majority of instances all the "improvements" to be seen. And when

after ten, twenty or thirty years persistence in this course, the country being settled in a compact manner, the lands that may still remain the property of private parties could be purchased outright on some such plan as has been herein suggested, or as circumstances then may determine.

But possession of the land must be had by the people, and the practical question is, not so much how shall the government proceed to get possession, but *when* will it adopt some plan with that end in view, and work to that end either by degrees or at once?

And the suggestion that the government buy all the lands that it can obtain, if adopted, should be adopted *at once*, for private enterprise is now accomplishing what the government only should do. We have already alluded to the recent large purchases made in this country by foreign capitalists who had availed themselves of the present cheapness of our lands to make good investments for themselves, and the following extracts from a few leading papers will show what we have to fear from this cause, and show how individuals are taking up immense tracts of our country:

"It is said that the recent buying of four million acres in Florida by Hamilton Disson, of Philadelphia, was the largest purchase of land ever made by an individual. The deed was given by the State, and it is understood that the price was about two dollars per acre. It is said that the land was bought for the purpose of speculation."—*Harper's Weekly*, July 16th, 1881.

"A special dispatch from Corpus Christi says: 'A sale was consummated on Thursday of Mr. Kennedy's ranch, comprising 240,000 acres of land, together with all the cattle, horses, buildings, etc., thereon, to Messrs. Underwood, Clark & Co., of Kansas City, Mo., for the sum of $463,465,40. The property was immediately resold to the Texas Land and

Cattle Company, of Dundee, Scotland.'"—*St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, 1882.

"The Mississippi press, alarmed at the recent heavy sales of land to speculators in that State, is urging that the State lands should be withdrawn from the market until they are explored, classified and appraised, and then they should be sold in such a way as to swell the school revenues of the State"—*Memphis Appeal*, 1882.

"A syndicate has been formed to buy 7,000,000 acres of Texas Pan Handle lands."—*Missouri Republican*, April 20th, 1882.

"Mr. B. H. Evers, of London, England, was in the city yesterday. Mr. Evers has purchased in the last few days 700,000 acres of land from the Levee Board and 300,000 from the State. There were some ninety deeds in all. The amount paid for the land was $90,000."—*Vicksburg Commercial.*

"A company of capitalists is being formed at Kenton, Ohio, to buy up from 10,000 to 20,000 acres of land for farming and grazing. They have entered into correspondence with the Secretary of the Missouri Immigration Society, but if they understand their business and want good land, they should come to Arkansas."—*Littte Rock Gazette*, December 16th, 1881.

Truly it is time the government was doing something in this matter.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE EFFECTS OF WISE LAND LAWS.

This order, said he, Magacles, of the barbarians, is not at all barbarian in character.—*Plutarch, Life of Pyrrhus.*

When a social fact is realized, it is surrounded by Providence with all the circumstances necessary to its development.—*M. De Cassagnac.*

Nature is very kind and beneficent, and while inexorable in the infliction of punishment when her laws are violated or disregarded, she is so lenient, that when any one of the fundamental requirements for the existence of happiness and virtue, and development is present, she allows their attainment to an extent which, while meagre indeed, when compared with that development, virtue and happiness, which would be ours were all her laws known and obeyed, is marvellously great considering the blindness which man has ever displayed in learning those laws, and the wanton disregard of their lessons he has so universally evinced, even when those laws were partially understood.

As there is no man who is so abjectly miserable, but what occasional happiness is his portion, so there is no nation, that has elevated itself in any degree above the lowest stage of human existence—abject savagery—but will furnish, in this respect, an illustration of the power and desire of nature to elevate humanity. There is a latent force in the universe, as there is a latent force in man. The first is the magnetism of God, the other is the spiritual consciousness of humanity.

The one, like the heat of the sun, is constantly operating to produce a development of good; the other is the force constantly attracted by this mysterious influence of Deity, but whose development is prevented by the pernicious operation of evils that arise because of bad government, ignorance and poverty. The influence of the sun will produce vegetation in a jungle, but because it is a jungle the vegetation will result in pernicious effects. Drain the swamp, and plant appropriate seed, and the same influence that produced evil in the first place will now be productive of good.

As with the heavenly trio, Hope, Faith and Charity, the greatest of these is Charity, or the love that produces charity; so in comparing the dark brow of Bad Government, the bloody hands of Ignorance, or the wan face of Poverty, in this the last of the Plutonian three, we recognize the actual and potential antithesis of the sweet-browed maid with the open hand.

And when these three grim and malignant forces shall have been driven from the earth, man will be able to attain, by the correct and equal development of the moral force we have mentioned, a happiness and delight, virtue and goodness, whose tendency shall ever be upward and onward, and which it was intended by God he should enjoy. And of the intensity and perfection of which he may now form some vague and weak conception only, by the experience of his brightest and happiest moments.

Beyond a certain depth, abject it is true, as in many cases it may be, but still limited, it is hard to conceive that man can by ignorance descend. For the very demands of nature, the exigencies of existence, will keep alive within him a certain mental activity, which however low in its development,

will always be higher than the most favorable circumstances, and the most assiduous training, can ever develop in a mere animal. And, therefore, let ignorance sink man as low as it possibly can, he will always be in possession of an intelligence, which both in kind and degree, will separate him broadly from the brute creation. Erroneous teachings are calculated to intensify ignorance. But natural ignorance is only the want of knowledge; and in every man there is an amount of common sense, which only requires the absence of erroneous *a priori* conceptions to be developed by experience and observation into knowledge.

So, too, with tyranny. Pernicious forms of government, whether they arise from anarchy or despotism will find in the very disasters they produce a cause of at least a partial cure. Some soldier of fortune, or some sagacious savage, will arise from the ruins of chaotic society, to restore in some degree the observance of law and order; and the knife of the assassin, or the turbulence of rebellion, will always prevent excesses arising from the exercise of individual power being carried beyond a certain point of despotism and cruelty.

But there is no such limitation to the operations of poverty, and thousands are annually killed in civilized countries by the hand of want;[a] and to relieve themselves from the operations of poverty, other thousands can only pray for work that will enable them to prolong a cheerless and a

[a] "Exact returns are not obtainable from every country, but the information is sufficiently complete to enable us to perceive that Europeans are now killing themselves at an annual average rate of one in five thousand and that, consequently, a total of somewhere about 60,000 persons are dying by their own hands each year on the Continent and in the British Isles * * * * * And as these miseries act mainly on the laboring classes, it is natural that the great majority of the suicides should be found among the poor; five-sixths of them, in round figures, are shown

hapless existence, or, failing this to obtain, for resignation to the mysterious decrees of that inscrutable Providence who, according to the ministers, appears to have ordained that man can only enjoy the heaven of which he dreams, by undergoing miseries in this world, which they declare to be a place of probation, and a theatre of necessary suffering.

And this inability to defend themselves on the part of the people, from the operation of pernicious politico-economic laws, will be in proportion as that people are law-abiding citizens. Just as a patient will suffer most who, under the hands of a quack, places most reliance in his skill, and has most faith in his knowledge.

And, therefore, of all the causes that go to foster the misery and vices of man, poverty is the most powerful and the hardest to eliminate. It is most obscure in its operations in the first place, and its cause is confused by the opinions of the wealthy of those nations which have made greatest progress over other countries in the accumulation of wealth, in the arts, manufactures and sciences. For the very prominence a nation so circumstanced occupies, is, or appears to be, the best possible argument for a continuation of that polity in the future which in the past has produced such brilliant so-called national results.

And, as much of this progress has been made at the expense of the blood of the people, and of the money of the

by the registers to be committed by working people. * * * * * Neither convicts nor prostitutes kill themselves in any appreciable proportions; they seem to grow indifferent to shame or fear or exasperation, and to have acquired the faculty of living on in callous calm under any infamy whatever"*—*Article, Suicides, in Blackwood's Magazine.*

*These have, as a rule, succeeded in accomplishing what is thought by our sociologists should be accomplished—"adaptation of character to circumstances,"—and glorious is the result!

people, these people have been taught by the horrors of war, that a resort to arms for the purpose of reconstructing society, is at best but a most uncertain remedy and a perilous undertaking. And being by nature good-tempered and long-suffering, they continue in their bewilderment, and in their degradation.

And as wealthy people, as a class, and as the rulers of the people, as a class, were never known voluntarily to effect changes which would apparently redound to their own disadvantage, the farce or the tragedy of the struggle for existence, continually gaining in intensity, is prolonged from generation to generation.

And the already rich, or the few successful aspirants for wealth and influence, ease their consciences of the reproach that the sorrows they daily witness may produce, by appeals to supposed laws of supply and demand; or account for their own success as being a result of superior knowledge, or capacity; and by repeating savage aphorisms of the necessity of a system that will insure the "survival of the fittest" as their authority for continued luxurious existence at the expense of their fellows, they deaden their conscience to the misery they see everywhere around them.

The poor, being denied all hope of prosperity in this world, fix their eyes on that promised hereafter, which is to recompense them for the ills of earth, and become, in proportion as they believe their preachers, but mere links in the hands of those who profit by their labor, to weld and strengthen the inexorable chains that bind them to their desolate destiny.[b]

[b] "What spirit their government and character denied, might have been inspired in some degree by the influence of religion; but the religion of the Greeks could only teach them to suffer and to yield."—*Gibbon, Vol. IV., p.* 579. The Greeks were Christians.

It may, therefore, prove instructive, and may carry conviction of the justness of our conclusion, that poverty is consequent upon individual ownership of the soil, if we will turn our eyes for a moment from the contemplation of our most highly civilized and Christian countries, to fix them on the condition of peoples in other and less civilized lands who, while debarred of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, electric lights and Bibles, have, nevertheless, by retaining the right of every man to free access to the soil, avoided that mistake which America and Europe made when they made land subject to purchase and sale.

The operation of the land laws of the ancient Peruvians afforded a striking illustration of the capacity of man to attain a high degree of civilization, of virtue and happiness, when the fundamental necessity for the production of happiness and virtue is even partially present. For the land laws in Peru were unequal, and the soil arbitrarily divided, and that not in a manner to secure the best results, but such as they were, they were more conducive to happiness than are the present land laws of the United States or Europe.

In estimating the degree of civilization the Peruvians had attained at the time of the conquest, we must bear in mind that this civilization was the product of only some 250 years of national existence, and had already reached nearly to the altitude of the civilization that Egypt enjoyed over 4,000 years ago. And who shall tell us what the civilization of Egypt was in its entirety, or how long Egypt had existed before the time that her history began to be written? And this civilization of Egypt, at the earliest time of which we have any knowledge, was greater than any civilization Europe could show from the fifth to the twelfth century. And this embraced a period of 700 years of Church effort

to attain what heathen Peru had accomplished in a greater degree in 250 years!

Not only, then, was the Peruvian civilization lacking in the element of time, as compared with the few good results it had taken 1,000 years to produce in Europe, but it labored under the great disadvantage of having a government "mild indeed in its character, but in its form a pure and unmitigated despotism;" and the further disadvantage of a monopoly by a class of such little education as existed among them. And they were besides unacquainted with the first principles of modern science. Yet, notwithstanding these great, these tremendous disadvantages, by avoiding monopoly of the soil by the few, nature, not frustrated at all points, was enabled to create a state of society which, for the exercise of virtuous actions and the possession of happiness, was unequaled and unapproached by any other nation of contemporary history, and unapproached in these respects by any one of those nations, who, besides having the experience of a much greater length of time to mature in, had attained considerable knowledge of the civilization of yet more ancient nations, had the science of Alexandria, and the learning of Arabia at their command, and withal, were blessed with a "Revelation," which, totally denied to the Peruvians, had shed for 1,200 years its heavenly wisdom upon them.

What was the secret of this success of the Peruvians? What was the cause of the perfection their civilization had attained in so short a time, under so many disadvantages? What was the secret of their freedom from poverty, which a hundred years later devastated Christian Spain, and had in the fourteenth century demoralized orthodox Scotland? What was the secret of those virtues and that

happiness which astonished and bewildered their Christian conquerors? An answer is readily found. All this was due to the existence of those land laws which, however incomplete and defective, were immeasurably superior in their observance of equitable distribution, and consequently in their beneficent results, to those of Christian Europe of that time or of any subsequent date. Says Prescott:

"The whole territory of the Empire was divided into three parts, one for the Sun, another for the Inca, and the last for the people. * * * * The lands assigned to the Sun furnished a revenue to support the Temple, and maintain the costly ceremonials of the Peruvian worship, and the multitudinous priesthood. Those reserved for the Incas went to support the royal state as well as the numerous members of his household, and his kindred, and supplied the exigencies of government. The remainder of the land was divided *per capita* in equal shares among the people. * * * * By a wise regulation any deficiency in the contributions of the Inca might be supplied from the granaries of the Sun" (thus taxing the clergy for the benefit of the State, a great improvement over modern and medieval methods of taxing the people for the benefit of the clergy *and* the nobility).

"But such a necessity could rarely have happened, and the providence of the government usually left a large surplus in the royal depositories, which was removed to a third class of magazines, whose design was to supply the people in seasons of scarcity, and occasionally to furnish relief to individuals whom sickness or misfortune had reduced to poverty, thus justifying the assertion of a Castilian document that a large portion of the revenues of the Inca found its way back again through one channel or another into the hands of the people. * * * * The magazines of grain, in particular, found by the Spaniards, would have sufficed for the consumption of the adjoining districts for several years. * * * * Such are some of the most re-

markable features of the Peruvian institutions, relating to property, as delineated by writers who, however contradictory in the details, have maintained a general conformity of outline."

"These institutions are certainly so remarkable that it is hardly credible they should ever have been enforced throughout a great Empire and for a long period of years. These institutions of the Peruvians were originally designed, like the institutions of Lycurgus, for a petty State, yet seemed like the magic tent in the Arabian tale, to have had an indefinite power of expansion, and were as well *suited to the most flourishing condition of the Empire as to its infant fortunes.*" (Italics ours.)

"Yet we have the most unequivocal testimony to the fact from the Spaniards who landed in Peru in time to witness their operations, some of whom—men of high judicial station and character—were commissioned by the government to make investigations into the state of the country under its ancient rulers."—*Prescott's Conquest of Peru, Vol. I.*

Prescott then gives what, in his opinion, are some of the bad results that followed upon these general institutions of the Peruvians. With that picture we have here no particular concern, except to say, in passing, that every disability under which the Peruvian common people were supposed to labor, because of the character of these institutions, can readily be paralleled in the condition of artisans and the better class of mechanics and small dealers in Christian lands, and are no more to be compared with the condition of the poor masses of our larger cities and highest civilization, than is the condition of the English mechanic to be compared with that of these same simple-minded natives when they were, in the name and for the interest of religion, handed over, by the special committee of monks sent from Spain to take care of and protect their interest, to slavery in the mines and on the plantations of their conquerors.

It is enough to say that whatever the Peruvian policy lacked in developing the higher energies of the individual, present modern science, and popular education, and a free government, would have been sufficient to have happily accomplished. For these factors will ever be, when allowed to perform their mission, a sufficient guarantee against the stagnation of a people's intellect, and for the acquisition of private property.

But after giving this reverse side of the medal for our inspection and instruction, he continues:

"But this is the dark side of the picture. If no man of the common people could become rich in Peru, no man could become poor; no spendthrift could waste his substance in riotous luxury; no adventuring schemer could impoverish his family by the spirit of speculation. The law was constantly directed to enforce a steady industry, and a sober management of his affairs. No mendicant was tolerated in Peru. When a man was reduced by poverty or misfortune (it could hardly be by fault) the arm of the law was stretched out to minister relief; not the stinted relief of private charity, nor that which is doled out drop by drop, as it were, from the frozen reservoirs of 'the parish,' but in generous measure, bringing no humiliation to the object of it, and placing him on a level with the rest of his countrymen. * * * * * The Spaniards who first visited the country are emphatic in their testimony that no government could have been better suited to the genius of the people, and no people could have appeared more contented with their lot, or more devoted to their government."

And as it is those vices which arise in our country from speculation and adventure, luxury and idleness, which are the curses of our civilization, it would be well for us to endeavor to obtain, in such important matters, some instruction from the land institution of the Indians, which alone rendered their freedom from similar evils possible.

We have in a previous chapter[c] adverted to the moral character of the Peruvians. We will only add a quotation from Prescott to show what great good, and what an amount of happiness, was the result to the natives through the beneficent operation of those land laws:

"With their manifold provisions against poverty the reader has already been made aware. They were so perfect that in their wide extent of territory, much of it smitten with the curse of barrenness, no man, however humble, suffered from the want of food or clothing. Famines, so common a scourge in every other American nation, and in *every other country of civilized Europe*, (italics ours) was an evil unknown in the dominion of the Incas.

"The most enlightened of the Spaniards who first visited Peru, struck with the general appearance of plenty and prosperity, and with the astonishing order with which every thing throughout was regulated, are loud in their expressions of admiration. No better government in their opinion could have been devised, for the people were contented with their condition, and free from vice. To borrow the language of an eminent authority of that early day, 'The mild and docile character of the Peruvians would have well fitted them to receive the teachings of Christianity, had the love of conversion instead of gold animated the breast of the conquerors.'"

What, then, was the reason why this nation, so peculiarly fortunate in its freedom from the curse of modern civilization—poverty, competition and speculation—did not advance to a higher grade of civilization, were not, in a word, completely happy and completely virtuous? For that they had some vices we may readily imagine, and having these complete happiness was impossible. But of how light a character those vices were, we may infer when we learn that the gravest charges brought against them by their

[c] *The Factors of Civilization, Vol. I., Chap. V.*

oftentimes vindictive and morose conquerors, were an addiction to drinking and to dancing.

And they were, by some, said "to be lazy, luxurious and licentious." That the common people were addicted to dancing is to be supposed, for their methodical system of agriculture left them with an abundance of time for recreation on their hand, and naturally their happy dispositions prompted them to expend their inexhausted vigor in exercises which in all times have been indulged in by the people, in proportion as they were free from care or drudgery. And that at these festivals, which were so frequent, they should indulge in the fermented drink of their country, we can well believe, and yet not pronounce them given up to the practices of debauchery, frivolity and vices. The charge of being lazy, luxurious and licentious, may have had some color of truth if directed against the idle nobility. And against these it must have been directed, since all testimony would exclude it from applying to the peasantry. And if among the idle rich these vices were frequent, they are only what might have been expected from an aristocracy whose system of government precluded advance through personal merit, or whose deficient knowledge debarred from those intellectual pursuits and studies which the rich are so qualified, by their opulence and their leisure, to pursue.

And we must remember that these charges were made only by a few, and we are authorized to infer that when made, they emanated from Dominican monks, whose morose and austere dispositions were, at that time, finding their most congenial pleasures and recreations in the burning of infidels in Spain, or in watching the writhing of some poor Jew or Morisco who, under the torture, was experiencing in his own person the happy effects of holy virtue, religiously understood.

But, admitting these charges to have had some foundation in fact, we may safely assert that the morality of the most dissolute of the subjects of the Inca, was far superior to that of the court of the people of Spain, England or France, at the same period, and, indeed, for at least two hundred years later.[d]

For the extent of licentiousness in Peru can be readily estimated when we consider the almost universal tribute to their freedom from vice, paid them by those best qualified to judge, and by the further statement that marriage was universal among the people, and that, at the time of the Conquest, there is said to have been not a prostitute in the Empire.

And the answer to the question we have propounded, why, with all this virtue and all this happiness, the people had not attained a higher grade of civilization and a more perfect development of virtue and happiness, may be

[d] "Of the number of regular prostitutes exercising their calling in France, during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, no correct estimate can be made. It was undoubtedly large. During the religious wars a writer on the side of Protestantism, undertook to draw up a statement of the number of prostitutes and lewd women, whose vices were *chargeable to the clergy.* His estimate is, of course, open to suspicion, as being a sectarian performance, but allowing for great exaggeration, it will still appear alarming. He calculates that there were, at that time, one million of women, more or less, who led, habitually lewd lives, and ministered to the passions of the clergy. These were independent of the married women who were led into adultery, and of the pimps and procuresses who were in clerical pay."—*Sanger's History of Prostitution, p.* 119. So much for the morals of Christian France at a time contemporary with the conquest of Peru. Writing on the same subject the same author says of Italy: "The excesses of this iron age were not limited to ordinary licentiousness; crimes against nature seem to have been prevalent, and are even alleged to have been a source of revenue. In a collection of Papal Lives, which has fallen under our notice, but which is not very par-

found in the following remarks, said to have been made by Tupac Inca Yupanqui, and which is also said to have been his favorite maxim, and often repeated: "*Science was not intended for the people, but for those of generous blood. Persons of low degree are puffed up by it, and rendered vain and arrogant, neither should such meddle with the affairs of government, for this would bring high offices into disrepute, and cause detriment to the State.*" In other words, the Peruvians, while they possessed in an imperfect measure one of the fundamental necessities for the development of virtue and happiness, were peculiarly deficient in those other two adjuncts to perfection of individual and national character and progress, a democratic constitutional form of government, and a system of education founded on induction and popularly presented.[e] But

ticular in giving its authorities,* we find it stated that a memorial was presented to Sextus IV by certain individuals of the family of the Cardinal of St. Lucia, for an indulgence to commit sodomy, and that the Pope wrote at the bottom of it the usual "*Fiat*." The case of Beatrice Cenci is better attested. Every one recollects the accumulated horrors of the story. The father, hating his children, his wife, all mankind, introduces prostitutes to his house, and debauches his daughter Beatrice by force. Through the instrumentality of a bishop, she procures him to be murdered, and, with her step-mother, was executed for the crime, the Pope refusing to show any mercy. The Count Cenci had been addicted to unnatural offenses, and had thrice compounded with the Papal Government for his crimes by paying an enormous sum of money, and the narrator says, that the acrimony of the Pope towards the wretched daughter was for having cut off a profitable source of revenue."—*Idem, p.* 159. "Up to this time, middle of fifteenth century, the Court of Spain seems to have been almost as strongly tinctured with licentiousness as those of other nations."—*Idem, p.* 170. For further details of the morals of Europe from the fifth to the sixteenth century, the reader is refered to *Lecky's History of Morals* and to the first volume of this work, chapter iv.

**The Roman Pontiffs*, New York, 1845.

[e] See *Factors of Civilization, Vol. I, Chap. VII; idem, Chap. VIII.*

we, knowing how comparatively happy their condition was, and realizing to what an extent they were rendered virtuous by their civilization, as deficient as it was in those factors we have mentioned as so necessary to render happiness and virtue complete and universal, we, of Europe and America, might form some idea of what our civilization would be, if, retaining our present advantages of education and liberty, we would but add to this condition a system of land distribution which, while it would make no rich man poor, would take off the edge of competition from all commercial transactions, would release from its cramped condition the mind of the unsuccessful but still struggling professional man. And would render it a matter of absolute certainty that every poor man that desired could have his little cottage and his little farm, and, earning by reasonable toil all the necessities of life, could gather his family around him in peace and contentment, and with a soul undwarfed and unmarred by incessant labor for a bare subsistence, would add one more to that class of independent yeomanry who, in all times and in all countries, have been alike remarkable for their virtue and influence on national happiness, character and prosperity.

The condition, then, of the Peruvians will enable us to form some idea of the happiness possible for man to attain on earth, if to the knowledge and liberty that England and America now possess, they would but add this important factor—the freedom of land.

Beyond and above the pernicious effects that were the consequence to the Peruvians of a despotic form of government, and an ignorance of science and the laws of nature, there was another cause of their imperfections, and that prevented them from discovering these laws, from advancing in knowledge, and that kept them chained to the igno-

rance of the past, that was—their theology and their priests. These priests were less bloodthirsty, it is true, than were those of heathen Mexico or of Christian Spain, but, nevertheless, these felt it incumbent upon them occasionally to offer a beautiful maiden or lovely babe as a sacrifice to the gods.

For, besides the injury done the people by their theological teachings and sacrificial rites, by fencing themselves around with "the mysteries derived in part from their office and partly from their birth," they were enabled to impose their deductive theories upon the nation, and thus they were the cause of original false ideas regarding man and nature and science, and were also the cause that prevented the people from investigating for themselves. Thus they perpetuated the ignorance they originated, or which they at least accepted and formulated.

Certainly no one will claim that the Peruvians were either better or happier for their theological ideas or because of their priests. But that this inability to produce happiness or virtue was not due to some innate defect in the Peruvian religion, is shown when we consider the effects in this particular that followed upon the introduction of Christianity. For we know that after the Conquest these docile and happy Indians were taken into the folds of the Christain Church, the then only established Christian Church, and yet they became all the more unhappy and miserable.

And the methods used by this Church to convert the Indians is exemplified by the following extract from Prescott who, writing of the march of Pizarro, says:

"After marching through the thickly settled hamlets which sprinkled the level region betwen the Cordillerras and the ocean, the natives welcomed them with rustic hospitality, providing good quarters for his troops, and abundant

supplies. Everywhere Pizarro made proclamation that he came in the name of the Holy Ghost and of the Sovereign of Spain, requiring the obedience of the inhabitants as true children of the Church and vassals of his Lord and Master. And as the simple people made no opposition to a formula of which they could not comprehend a syllable, they were admitted as good subjects of the crown of Spain, and their act of homage—or what was readily interpreted as such—was duly recorded and attested by a notary. * * * And when he selected the valley of Tangarala, which he did because of its richness, as a site for his new city, after parcelling out the adjacent territory among the residents, he allotted to each a number of the natives to assist them in their labors, because it was evident that the colonists could not support themselves without the services of the Indians, the ecclesiastics and the leaders of the expedition all agreed that a *repartimunto* of the natives would serve the cause of religion and tend greatly to their spiritual welfare, since they would thus have the opportunity of being initiated into the true faith."

And by the farther extract which is taken from Hassaureck's *Four Years Among Spanish-Americans*: "The documents by which the Spanish Government sometimes surrendered entire villages of free-born Indians into perpetual slavery were generally drawn up in the following form:

'To you, A. B., I recommend by way of deposit———In-dians of the village of———! And I do authorize you to use them in your mines and on your farms extracting gold and availing yourselves of their services, on condition that you take care to instruct them in the Christian doctrine, and other things concerning our Holy Catholic faith; because thereby I exonerate the conscience of His Majesty the King, our Lord and my own.'"[1]

[1]Writing of the early American slave trade, Mr. John Lawrence says: "It is said that Charles the V., Louis the XIII, and Queen Elizabeth had some trouble with their conscience about this horrid trade, but they were quieted by the argument that it brought the African into a good condi-

And to what extent these holy beneficiaries did use their pupils in extracting gold from the mines, and in work on the plantations, may be inferred when we learn from Lecky[g] that, owing to the hardness of the labor required, and the cruelty with which the natives were treated, these miserable beings committed suicide by hundreds, and for this the Spaniards could find no more effectual preventive than the threat that, they too, would kill themselves, and thus would follow their victims into the spirit world.[h]

Fortunately for man Peru was not the only country whose land laws were different from those of present civilized nations. Says the Rev. Mr. Malcom:

"In Burmah human wants have a limit easily attained,

tion to be converted."—*The Slavery Question, Fourth Edition, Dayton, Ohio,* 1857.

And writing on "The Christian Religion," Mr. Jere Black said, in the August (1881) number of the *North American Review*: "There can be no question that when a Jew took a neighboring savage into his family, trained him, taught him to work, and gave him a knowledge of the true God, he conferred upon him a most beneficent boon."

Thus through all ages false theories of religion pervert our nature.

[g] *History of European Morals.*

[h] Compare the treatment that the women of Bohemia and France, Scotland and Ireland (modern Christian nations), with the following description of field labor as pursued by the men and women of ancient Peru: "In plowing, six or eight strong men were attached by ropes to the stake (which served as a plow and drew it forcibly along, pulling together and keeping time as they moved, by chanting their national songs, in which they were accompanied by the women who followed in their train, breaking up the clods with their rakes."—*Vol. I, p.* 136—*Conquest of Peru.**

*"But the degradation of Ireland was to be seen even in this favored and prosperous part of the country. I saw women and men working side by side, in the midst of clay, making brick, and in the ditches digging, and I felt, as I have so often been compelled before to feel, that no people can be really civilized that permit the female sex to be thus enslaved."—*Prime's Europe and the East.*

and gives ample leisure to all for intellectual and moral culture. In this respect Burmah is superior to our own country, where only by incessant labor can the majority earn a bare subsistence, leaving but little leisure for the promotion of the higher wants of our nature. The regular government and laws, written language, established literature, settled abodes, foreign commerce, respectable architecture, good roads and bridges, manufactures, and the condition of women, show that the Burmese are a civilized people. An excellent system exists for the division of property. The King owns all the land, of which any subject can use what he can cultivate. If he neglects what he encloses, it can be used by another. This prevents a monopoly of land, and is a judicious arrangement."

Writing of the natives of Madagascar, Sibree says:

"There is much that is gratifying to a benevolent mind in the strong family affection and general kindness of heart that exists among the Malagasey people. In this respect * * * they might even set an example to those who pride themselves upon their superiority. The soil of Madagascar is very fertile, and, by an old custom having the force of law, all the land in the country is theoretically vested in the sovereign, and foreigners could not purchase, nor even rent it, without special permission. * * * * Although women in Madagascar are not respected as in Europe (*he means in some parts of Europe*) neither are they made the slaves and drudges as is usual in barbarous and semi-civilized countries." (*He means in some barbarous and semi-civilized countries.*)

* * * "No possible mark of honor and respect shown to a King is withheld from a Queen, who, indeed, has sometimes been regarded with a chivalrous devotion more in accordance with Western than Eastern ideas."—p. 188.

"Whatever may be done by the Queen is declared to be sweet, to be pleasant, to be *swallowed* by her subjects, who dare not venture to challenge the Sun, for so she is styled. Servile as all this sounds to our English ears, it does not after all exceed the sycophancy and the extravagant abase-

ment of the subject and laudation of the sovereign, which were common in addressing our own Kings and Queens of the Tudor and Stuart families."—p. 319.

Add to what we have said on this subject the following extract from *China, by Hugh Murray and others*, and the conviction will force itself upon our minds that private ownership of soil is the cause of poverty and all its attendant and collateral evils.

"The reign of Chihoung, whose iron sway crushed all feudal pretensions, is lamented as the era when land became an object of private property, and when the domains, which had formerly belonged to the public, were parcelled out among the chiefs who aided in raising his dynasty to the throne."[1]

We cannot conclude this cursory survey of the cause of an advance in civilization and refinement, and in the acquisition of property in lands bereft of the influences of Bibles and Christianity, without some reference to the land laws and the civilization of that oldest of all governments, the Egyptian.

The ancient Egyptians, a people who had arrived at such a high grade of intellectual and moral development as to have enunciated, 4,000 years ago, the grand idea that "*truth and justice were the cardinal virtues, because they related more particularly to others.*" Of whom it is said that "*the very spirit of their laws was to give protection and assistance to the oppressed,*" and who, "*besides the care taken by them that justice should be administered according to the real merits of the case,*"

[1] "We read in their histories of grants of land to certain officers of State, and of government, and of military lands, in which may be perceived a resemblance to the feudal fiefs or benefices. Whatever may have been the tenure in former times, the Emperor is now, as in most Oriental countries, regarded as the ultimate owner of all lands, from which he receives a tax of about 10 per cent,"—*John Francis Davis, F. R. S., etc. China and the Chinese, Vol. I, p.* 171.

had provided "*that before their tribunals no favor or respect of persons should be permitted*," and who to all this "added another important, but now obsolete regulation, that justice should be gratuitously administered,[j] and it was therefore accessible to the poor, as well as to the rich." A people who, 4,000 years ago, had a religion of which ours is but a modified copy.

"The peculiar character of Osiris, of whom a legend relates that he came upon earth for the benefit of mankind, with the title of 'Manifester of good and truth;' of his being put to death by the malice of the evil one; of his burial and resurrection, and his becoming the Judge of the dead, are the most interesting features. * * * This was the great mystery more than 4,000 years ago, for this myth and his worship were of the earliest times, and universal in Egypt." *Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians.*

[j] "However imperfect may be the information we may possess on this head, it is easy to see from ancient writers that Egyptian legislation respected all the best feelings of the human mind, and answered the highest wants of social order."—*Lenormant and Chevalier's Ancient History of the East, Vol. I, p.* 299.

"All business before the legal tribunals was transacted in writing—never *viva voce*—in order, it was said, that nothing might excite the feelings of the Judge, and thus prejudice his impartiality."—*Idem.*

Compare the above with the following:

"The greatest grievance which now afflicts the people of English-speaking countries is the inefficiency of the prevailing judicial system. Justice is practically denied to the litigants who have not fortunes to expend in the enforcement of their rights. The delays and appeals from one court to another entail a loss and expenditure which is hardly preferable to the abandonment of the subject matter of the litigation. The oppression which takes place under the sanction of judicial decrees based upon reasoning that does not carry conviction with it, is absolutely fearful. The summary methods of judicial procedure which prevails in despotic countries cannot be attended with more hardship than our own system, which we sometimes boast of as the perfection of human reason." —*Oakland Times.*

Egypt, whose progress in agriculture, in manufactures and science, made her wealth, her art and her wisdom proverbial before the time of Abraham; who was proudest and greatest among nations when Greece was in its infancy,[k] owed its long existence, its prosperity and the general happiness of its people, not, as has been generally supposed, to the "superiority of its legislation," but to the land laws of Egypt. Its legislation undoubtedly was an important element in perfecting the development of the nation, but other countries have had as wise laws and as great law-givers as Egypt, but they lived and died and passed away, and Egypt still remained.

Osirtasen I, who ascended the throne about 2080 B. C., is said to have divided all the lands of Egypt, with the exception of that which belonged to the priests and soldiers, into squares of equal areas, assigning to each peasant his peculiar portion, or a certain amount of these *arouras*, for which he annually paid a fixed rent, and having instituted a yearly survey of the lands, any deficiency resulting from a fall of the banks during the inundation, or other accident or causes, was stated in the returns and deducted from the government demands.[l]

The method adopted with reference to the land allotted to the soldiers was a most admirable and judicious one, and served in part to counteract the mischievous results likely to follow by placing so much of the land in the hands of the

[k] "While Greece was still in its infancy, Egypt had long been the leading nation of the world. She was noted for her magnificence, her wealth and power, and all acknowledged her pre-eminence in wisdom and civilization." *Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, p.* 263, *Vol.* II. *Also, see Gibbon, Vol.* 10, *p.* 171.

[l] *Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, Vol. II, p.* 222.

priests.[m] And far superior to the efforts made time and again by the Romans to provide for their discharged veterans, by settling them on land, confiscated or won from an enemy; hoping by this means to repay the soldiers for the valor exercised in war, and to check and recuperate that waste and demoralization which eventually undermined the greatness and destroyed the existence of the Empire.

Besides the direct beneficial economical result produced on the country and on the soldiers by regulations which, insuring him possession of land, guaranteed the means of an independent living, and was thus a stimulus to industry and a conservator of his morals, there was a love of country, a patriotism incited and developed which made him always the trusted defender of that country in the hour of need.[n] Sesostris assigned one-third of the land to the soldiers, in order, says Diodorus, "that those who exposed themselves to danger in the field might be more ready to

[m] "These priests filled the highest offices and possessed the largest and best part of the land. To render this property inalienable, they represented it as the gift of the goddess Isis, who, when she was on the earth, assigned to them a third part of the kingdom. These estates were free from every tax (!) they were generally let for a rent, which was paid into the treasury of the temple to which the land belonged, and was employed in the expenses of worship, and in the support of the priests and their numerous subordinates" (the old story). These, the classical writers say, spent nothing of their own property, each of them received a portion of the sacred food given them ready cooked; they even had every day a large quantity of beef and goose flesh; wine also was given them, but they were not permitted to eat fish."—*Ancient History of the East by Lenormant and Chevalier—Vol. I, p.* 290.

[n] Among the laws regarding soldiers,—he who had deserted his ranks, or had not obeyed the orders of his officers, was punished, not with death but with infamy. If afterwards he wiped away his shame by any glorious action, he was reinstated in his rank. Thus the law made dishonor a punishment more dreadful than death, in order to accustom the soldiers

undergo the hazards of war, from the interest they felt in the country as occupiers of the soil. For it would be absurd to commit the safety of the community to those who possessed nothing which they were interested in preserving.

"Each soldier whether on duty or not, was allowed twelve *arouras* of land (a little more than eight English acres) free of all charges: * * * * to these farms the soldiers returned after discharge from service, and the possession of which tended to habits of industry, and kept up a taste for active employment.[o]

It was to this cause, then, the division of the land among the people, that we may ascribe the duration of an Empire, which lasted with the same form of government for so great a length of time.[p]

And not only did Egypt owe her long existence to her system of land regulations, but to this cause, too, she owed the happiness and the virtue which, at the period of which we are writing, so generally characterized her peasantry.

to regard infamy as the greatest of all evils; and at the same time those who had been punished in this way were incited to attempt great actions to recover their former positions, whilst if they had been put to death, they could have been of no more use to the State."—*Ancient History of the East, Vol.* I. *p.* 299—*Lenormant and Chevalier.*

[o] *Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, p.* 336.

[p] Quedelet has a chapter, says Baker in his translation of *Montesquieu's Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans*, in which he gives the periods of the natural existence of several ancient nations.

According to him Egypt existed as an independent nation, under one form of government 1663 years, and Baker says this period is much too short—see page 409.

"The political constitution of Egypt never varied during the whole of the enormous period of the duration of the Empire of the Pharaohs. The country always remained one united monarchy, the most absolute probably that has ever existed in the world."—*Lenormant and Chevalier's Ancient History of the East, p.* 294, *Vol. I.*

"The wants of the poor classes," says Wilkinson, "were easily supplied; the abundance of grain, herbs and esculent plants afforded an ample supply to the inhabitants of the valley of the Nile, at a trifling expense and with little labor."

The condition of woman is a fair index to the humanity and civilization of a people. Applying this test to the civilization of Egypt, we may gain some idea of what nature may do towards promoting the happiness of man, when the fundamental conditions of her requirements are even partially fulfilled.

Says Wilkinson:

"In the treatment of women they (the Egyptians) appear to have been very far advanced beyond other wealthy communities of the same era, having usages very similar to those of modern Europe. And such was the respect shown to them that precedence was given to them over men, and the wives and daughters of kings succeeded to the throne like the male branches of the royal family. * * * * It was not a mere influence which they possessed, which women often acquire in the most arbitrary Eastern communities, nor a political importance accorded to a particular individual. * * * It was a right acknowledged by law, both in private and public life."[q]

We can thus ascribe all the good results that followed upon ancient Egyptian civilization to the natural operation of the intellectual and moral nature of man which, founding its civilization on a system of land laws that guaranteed a long natural existence, permitted wealth and culture to become possible without necessitating distress and moral deg-

[q] "A woman condemned to death while *enciente* was not executed until her child was born, as it was thought the height of injustice to make the innocent participate in the punishment of the guilty, and to visit the crime of one person upon two."—*Lenormant and Chevalier's Ancient History of the East, Vol. I., p.* 299.

radation upon the mass of the people.[r] And we need not hesitate to ascribe the subsequent decline of Egypt, and her final destruction as a prosperous and independent nation, to a departure from the ancient laws of the kingdom respecting land.

That this departure took place, and that these changes were in operation, as early as 800 B. C., is evident from this paragraph in Wilkinson: "The extravagance of those who were in receipt of funds arising from extensive lands, had that early begun to excite envy and hopeless emulation among the poor classes, and extravagance and idleness among the rich," and produced a corruption of public morals that called for the enactment of laws by Asychis regarding debts and payments of obligations, as severe as they had formerly been unknown and unnecessary.

And the movement thus early inaugurated was facilitated by contact with the then modern civilization of Greece.

For, five hundred years later, we see that the latter Ptolemies making, among other changes in the primitive laws of Egypt, changes in relation to the privileges of the soldiers in their old rights to land; these were abolished, and thus

[r]The government that prevailed in Egypt, being entirely wrong in principle, being based upon the absolute right of one man to govern, being in fact an absolute despotism, it could not be otherwise than detrimental to the interest of the nation. The consequence was, great servility among the people. But, as Lenormant and Chevalier say, this loss of individuality, and the servility, which was so pronounced a characteristic of the Egyptians, could have lasted so many ages only because the people "were thoroughly imbued with the idea that their government was an emanation from the Divine will. A lively religious faith, perverted in this degrading way, could alone have reconciled them to such a servile condition."—p. 295.* This fact, in connection with the ignorance on all subjects of a truly scientific nature, and their belief in sorcery, sufficiently accounts for their shortcomings.

*See *The Factors of Civilization, Vol. II., Chap. VII.*

giving free scope to the operation of those general laws that will always follow private ownership of land, produced a luxurious and arrogant wealthy few, and a multitude of miserable, pleasureless, starving poor. And thus, from the gradual and protracted operation of this cause, Egypt, in spite of her knowledge, in spite of her civilization, notwithstanding her religion, by allowing land to become the subject of private ownership, was in her turn overtaken by the inexorable Nemesis of States, and eaten through with corruption, and palsied by a multiplication of impotent laws, passed from before the eyes of man, surrendered her scepter of empire, and, leaving for the mystification and admiration of all succeeding ages the imperishable monuments of her days of vigor and grandeur, added her own to the mysterious memories of departed nationalities.[s]

If now, returning from such distant shores and such ancient days, we look nearer home, and to the present, to note the results of wise land legislation, we will see the same good effects produced as we have seen were the consequences in Peru, Burmah and Egypt.

Mr. Brace was in the city of Debreczin, in Hungary, in 1851, and he furnishes some interesting facts regarding that city:

"In all its 55,000 inhabitants, it does not contain a single beggar. Some of the finest houses were built by the Bauer, or peasant, that is the class who have no political rights, and were subject to feudal labor."

[s]It will not be understood that we ascribe the downfall of Egypt entirely to the changes in her primitive land laws. In Egypt, as elsewhere, despotism and superstition, kings and priests, internal dissensions and foreign wars, the introduction of slaves and the imposition of severe taxation produced ultimately their legitimate result—dissolution. Wise land laws, even if adhered to, cannot avert destruction from a nation, when the other elements are wanting, any more than can education or liberty alone.—*See Vol. I. of this work, chapters VII. and VIII.*

This surprising prosperity was due, says Mr. Brace, and so accounted for by the people, as being the result of the operations of an old law, that no citizen should own over 160 acres of land. The inhabitants of this city were noted for their hospitality and politeness, even of the poorest peasants these traits were proverbial.

If now we desire to know why, in the practice of virtue and the possession of happiness, the inhabitants of this city had not attained an eminence so conspicuous as to have drawn upon them the wondering and admiring eyes of the rest of Europe, an explanation is afforded in the very paragraph relating to the peasants, "a class devoid of political rights, and who were subject to feudal labor;" and by the further information that Mr. Brace gives us, when he says, that out of the whole population of 55,000 not one hundred could read!! In other words, though two of the fundamental factors essential to produce perfect happiness and perfect virtue were absent (knowledge and liberty) such is the force of nature, such the upward tendency of man, that possessing one requisite, freedom from poverty, and an approximately correct basis upon which to found their system of political economy, they attained a development so marvellous in its good results, that only those can appreciate, as it should be appreciated, who have had an opportunity to compare this result with the result to the mass of the people in Germany, England and Ireland, in fact with the result in any city of corresponding size in Europe or America.

Now suppose that in a city so happily provided for in the respect of competency, with a practically unlimited amount of land to prevent competition from producing its chilling and hardening effects, we gradually introduce a system of

education which will reveal God in every object that attracts the attention, and with this practical education, an acquaintance with general literature and the past history of the world; and also introduce gradually a constitutional government founded upon equal rights, and what might we not expect?

We cannot close this chapter without drawing the attention of the reader to that wise provision of the great Hebrew law-giver, Moses, embodied in his laws for the government of his people.

It was ordered that at the end of every fifty years, all lands sold, or otherwise transferred, should revert to the original possessor or his heirs. And in view of what we have seen to have been the laws of the ancient Egyptians, and remembering that Moses was raised at the Court of the Pharaohs, and was learned in their institutions, we can readily perceive from what source he obtained his reasons for the course he pursued in regulating possession of land among the Jews.

CHAPTER XV.

SWITZERLAND AND FRANCE.

"In this unequal contest in which the produce of the land is claimed by one as his exclusive property, is used by another as a lucrative object of trade, and is required by a third for the daily and necessary support of life, all the profits of the intermediate agents are accumulated on the head of the defenseless consumer."—*Gibbon, Vol. II, p.* 355.

While many will agree with the conclusions arrived at, that free lands are theoretically desirable, the large majority even of these will be dismayed by the magnitude of the steps that will have to be taken to produce this result, and will enquire if it is not possible to divide the lands into small holdings, but still allow each man a *title* to what he holds or may acquire by purchase, gift or inheritance. And thus, by a gradual subdivision of large holdings, put the land in the possession of small proprietors? Every one will admit the advantage to the country to be derived from small farms; and, it may be said, that even now a number of our large farms are undergoing this process of subdivision. And, it may be asked, is not this a guarantee that in course of time this process will overtake other sections of our country, and include all the large plantations?

We have seen that land division assumes three phases: first, large estates; then, from numerous causes, these become divided up into small farms, and then comes the last phase; these, when competition has done its work, will be again bought up by those who have been successful in the

"battle" of life, and large estates are the final result. And we have seen that the completeness with which this result is effected, is an index of the condition of the internal decay of those nations, who, in their youth, were rendered lusty and ambitious by an abundance of small proprietors. In the North where, from the climate and the unproductive nature of the soil, and for mutual protection, the people contented themselves at first with the ownership of small farms—the process is shortened. For, in the North, the other and final process of amalgamation is now most conspicuously noticeable. In the West, because of free labor, and immigration of persons of limited means, the farms in the main are small; but here, too, machinery is taking the place of free labor, and many original purchases are large, and these, from the way in which they are worked, will be soon exhausted, and will then be sold to small farmers who, as immigrants, have the means, or as new comers, have the confidence to buy, on credit or for cash, these worn out and subdivided estates.

But, in the course of time, these small farmers will become embarrassed and will be closed out one by one And large estates will, in the West, also be the rule. In the South, where slavery was profitable, the large plantation system that flourished under conditions that characterized the South prior to the war, is now, owing to the abolition of slavery, assuming what, in its case is the second phase, and the South will soon present, in this respect, the same aspect that originally characterized the Eastern States, and that now prevails in great measure in the West, that is, will be divided, in great measure, into small farms. But in the South, also, it will only be a question of

time, civilization and competition, for these then small holdings to be again the property of large proprietors.

But, it will be asked, are there not countries where small farms have existed and continue to exist with beneficial results to the country and the individual farmers? Yes, we have Mr. Ruskin's word for it, that he "can show us examples, millions of them, of happy people, made happy by their own industries. Farm after farm I can show you in Bavaria, Switzerland and the Tyrol, and such other places."* "*Such other places.*" This is the reason for the exception these countries present to the tendency to consolidation observable in other European nations. And the description given by Marmontel of his native place of Bort, will make this reason clear, and why Bort could furnish such beautiful scenery, such happy homes and such a delightful writer:

"Bort, situated on the river Dordogne, between Auvergne and the province of Limoges, is a frightful place enough, seen by the traveler descending suddenly on it, lying, as it does, at the bottom of a precipice and looking as if the storm-torrents would sweep it away, or as if some day it must be crushed under a chain of volcanic rocks, some planted, like towers, on the height which commands the town, and others already overhanging, or half up-rooted; but, once in the valley, and with the eye free to wander there, Bort becomes full of smiles."

Thus we see Bort was situated in one of those "other such" regions as likewise characterizes the Tyrol and Switzerland. That is to say, at the foot of precipices, among mountains, with crags and boulders all around.

Now, we have the reason why small farms still exist in those lands to which Mr. Ruskin so often and so happily alludes.

*Letters to Workingmen and Laborers.

In countries without a seaport, and where railroads are costly to construct—with the land rugged and for the most part sterile, capital in organized form has no incentive to expend itself in the acquisition of large estates. But in countries that are by nature less beautiful, but endowed with a more productive soil, with prairies and meadows constituting the character of the lands—with seaports, or where railroads can be built quickly and cheaply, there we see capital exerting itself, and there competition soon produces mortgages, debts and distress, and there will the small proprietors be exchanged for the large real estate owner—*and* the tenant.

Mr. Ruskin has told us what was the result of small farming in the Tyrol, in Bavaria, and Switzerland, and Marmontel what its character was in the mountains of France.

Ask our farmers of Illinois if they can behold in Illinois the same picture.

Capitalist do not offer money on a liberal scale on time to the peasantry of Tyrol and take mortgages on the land for security. These farms, in many instances, would be but poor property for the capitalist to possess in place of their money, should they have to foreclose the mortgages. But in New Orleans capital comes from England and offers itself in large quantities to the planters on the accessible and magnificent alluvial lands of the Mississippi river.

How is it in France generally? Farming, on a small scale, is carried on more universally than any other country in Europe. And with the result of making France, perhaps, the most *recuperative* nation in the world. But this division of land, embracing the right of ownership, and the right to buy or sell, the evil results that follow in consequence are almost if not quite as great on the morals and happiness of the

people, as private ownership in land has proven to have been in Ireland and England. For in France the process of amalgamation and sub-division causing indebtedness, mortgages, and distress, are in full operation and the results are growing more and more alarming. Only to-day we clipped the following from a paper published in Nashville, Tenn., under date of January 16th, 1882:

"The number of beggars of all kinds who have made their appearance in the streets of Paris this winter has largely exceeded the usual number, though so far the weather has been mild, and even sunny. The depots of mendicity are said to be already full, as well as the hospitals, while the jails are too small for the number of criminals of a different type. The police acknowledge that in the case of beggars they are, and always have been, all but helpless."

Says Lady Verney, writing in the *Contemporary Review* for January, 1882, of the peasant proprietors of France:

"In general, the sickly, worn look of the women, and even of the men in the fields; was very striking; they are under-fed and over-worked, said our doctor friend. They are frugal almost to a fault, eat little but rye bread, which often brings on illness peculiar to itself,—'*des etourdissements, des frevres*', when touched by ergot. They do not drink their own wine, and only the buttermilk from their own cows. He said that the *morcellement* of land is so great, and the mortgages on it so heavy, that the peasants cannot live on the produce of the plots; in a bad year they are reduced to starvation, there is much begging and a great deal of private charity. My mother, generally, has to keep alive four or five families in the winter, and often asks me for a sack of corn.

"They lead hard lives in the villages, said every one. The weakly look of the children is sad to see; the doctor said mothers were forced to go out to work and could not take proper care of them."

Of another district the lady writes: "The women were carrying great weights, working bare-headed in the fields; washing bare-legged in the streams, driving the rude plows", etc. And again, "The amount of work done by the women is enormous, * * * even on Sunday, poor souls, they work on after mass, with an attempt at better clothes, it is true, but they are too down-trodden to have courage enough to attend to their looks, or to the looks of their houses. Indeed the use of beauty is certainly altogether ignored in French country life here. A woman is treated as a beast of burden, and the general civilization suffers, * * * We did not see a single book or newspaper, or ornament of any kind in the thirty-five or forty houses we visited. The struggle for life is so severe, the wolf of starvation is so close to the door, that the effort to get bread enough to eat seems to exhaust all their energies. They simply preserve life at the expense of all that makes life worth living."

And the following extract from "*Claret and Olives*," (Angus B. Reach) will show us what was the condition of the peasantry of France, as seen by him:

"The immense majority of the cultivators (of the soil) are unlettered peasants, hinds, who till the land in the unvarying, mechanical routine handed down to them from their forefathers." * * * "They are bound down in the most abject submission to every custom, for no other reason than that it is a custom. Two-thirds[b] of the population are agriculturists, and yet agriculture is an unhonored occupation." * * * "The tendency of landed property, under the system in question, is to continue diminution in size. This tendency does not stop with the interest of the party concerned; it goes on in spite of them, and the only practical check is nothing but a new evil. When a man finds that his patch of land is insufficient to support his family, he borrows money and buys more land. In nine cases out of ten the interest to be paid to the lender is greater than

[b]George M. Towle, in his *Modern France*, says "over half."

the profits the borrower can extract from the land, and bankruptcy and reduction to the condition of a day-laborer is sooner or later the inevitable result."

Our legislators in America would seek to remedy this evil by limiting, by law, the amount of interest on loans, ignorant of the fact that the more they interfere with what should be an entirely personal matter, to be agreed upon by the contracting parties, the more expedients they make lenders resort to, and the more they embarrass borrowers. And with the further and more vital consequence of forcing capital, by reducing interest on loans, into other channels of investment, prominent among which is the purchasing of lands.[c] Thus, in their endeavor to cure a symptom of disease they increase the very cause of the disease itself.

To return to Mr. Reach:

"The infinitesmal patches of land are cultivated in the most rude and uneconomical fashion; not a franc of capital further than that sunk in the purchase of spade, pick and hoe is expended on them." This writer then asks: "Are small proprietors, in cases in which spade industry cannot be economically applied, injurious to the social and industrial interests of the community in which they exist?"

The reader's attention is requested to his reply to this question:

"The following propositions appear to me to sum up what may be said on either side of the question:

"Small landed proprietors undoubtedly tend to produce an industrious population. A man always works hardest for himself.

[c] "As there are no public funds in China, the purchase of land is the chief, if not the only, mode of rendering capital productive with certainty and regularity, and free from the anxiety and risk of commercial adventure."—*John Francis Davis, F. R. S., on China and the Chinese, Vol. II, p.* 378.

"Small landed holdings tend to breed a spirit of independence and wholesome moral self-appreciation and reliance.

"On the other hand, small landed holdings, by breeding a poor and ignorant race of proprietors, keep back agriculture and injure the whole community of consumers; and small landed holdings tend to grow smaller than it is the interest of their owners that they should become. Capital, borrowed at usurious rates of interest, is then had recourse to for the purpose of enlarging individual properties, and the result is a production of a race of involved, mortgaged and frequently bankrupt proprietors."[d]

"At this present moment," continues Mr. Reach, "I believe the proprietorships of France to be as bankrupt as that of the southwest of Ireland. The number of encumbered estates across the channel would stagger the stoutest calculator. The capitalists, notaries, land-agents and, others in the towns, and not the peasantry, are the real owners of the mortgaged soil. The nominal proprietors are sinking deeper and deeper at every struggle, and they see no hope before them save one—socialism. French socialism is but the result of French poverty. A ruined laborer has no resource but casual charity, no law stands between him and starvation. He has no right to his life unless he can support himself, and as the ponderous machinery of the law gradually grinds down his property to an extent too small for him to exist on, and as the increasing interest swallows up the comparatively diminished products, he sees nothing before him but a scramble."

Compare the description given in Vol. I, Chap. IV of this work, of the condition of the savages of New Guinea, with the following description of the condition of many poor people

[d] But it should be remembered there are many very large estates in France, and if these were open to the farmer there would be no necessity for such minute sub-divisions as at present is the result of making the children of the poor, as they grow to manhood, divide among themselves the already small farms of their fathers.

in "Christian" France, and judge how much the latter are the gainers by modern civilization :

"Is the poor man a member of society, or an enemy to it? We ask for an answer.

"All around him he finds the soil pre-occupied; can he cultivate the earth for himself? No, for the right of the first occupant has become a right of property. Can he gather the fruits which the hand of God ripens in the path of man? No for, like the soil, the fruits have been *appropriated.* Can he hunt or fish? No, for that is a right which is dependent upon the government. Can he draw water from a spring? No, for the proprietor of the field is, in virtue of his right to the field, proprietor of the fountain. Can he, dying of hunger and thirst, stretch out his hands for the charity of his fellow creatures? No, for there are laws against begging. Can he, exhausted by fatigue and without a refuge, lie down to sleep upon the pavements of the streets? No, for there are laws against vagabondage. What, then, can the unhappy man do? He will say, 'I have hands to work with, I have intelligence, I have youth, I have strength; take all this, and in return give me a morsel of bread.' This is what the working men do say. But even here the poor man may be answered, 'I have no work to give you.' What is he to do then?"—*Louis Blanc's Organisation des Travail.*

The philosophical student of history will admit the importance of the measure we so strongly recommend in the freeing of the lands in America, when he sees the result that private ownership of soil has produced in France and Europe generally, and comparing the extract above given from Louis Blanc with the statement of Tiberius Gracchus, over two thousand years ago, on the result to Rome of the same cause, will recognize why it is "that history repeats itself." The same effects will always follow the same causes, and we may as well recognize the impotency of attempting

to prevent these results from occurring, by legislative repressive enactments, or religious teachings, as long as these causes exist.

The following is that statement we have reference to, and which derives additional interest from its similarity to the above extract from the writings of the French reformer:

"But though this reformation (of the monopoly of land) was managed with so much tenderness that, all the formal transactions being passed over, the people were only thankful to prevent abuses of the like nature for the future, yet, on the other hand, the moneyed men, and those of great estates, were exasperated, through their covetous feelings against the law itself, and against the law-giver through anger and party spirit. They, therefore, endeavored to seduce the people, declaring that Tiberius was designing a general re-division of lands, to overthrow the government, and put all things into confusion. But they had no success, for Tiberius, maintaining an honorable and just cause, and possessed of eloquence sufficient to have made a less creditable action appear plausible, was no safe or easy antagonist, when, with the people crowding around the hustings, he took his place and spoke in behalf of the poor. 'The savage beasts,' said he, 'in Italy have their particular dens, they have their places of repose and refuge, but the men who bear arms and expose their lives for the safety of their country, enjoy in the meantime nothing more in it but the air and light; and having no houses or settlements of their own, are constrained to wander from place to place with their wives and children.' He told them that the commanders were guilty of a ridiculous error when, at the head of their armies, they exhorted the common soldiers to fight for their sepulchres and altars; when not any among so many Romans is possessed of either altar or monument, neither have they any houses of their own, or hearths of their ancestors to defend. They fought indeed, and were slain, but it was to maintain the luxury and wealth of other men. They

were styled the masters of the world, but, in the meantime, had not one foot of ground which they could call their own."[e]

And to return to the consideration of the condition of France, what is the condition of those notaries, land agents, capitalists, and others in the towns, who are the real owners of the land? The following extract from the *London Economist*, of January 31st, 1882, will show in part:

"The close of the year 1881 has been the turning point in the wild speculation in new companies and in some favored old stock which has raged on the Paris Bourse during the last two years. The origin of this fever of speculation may be traced, in the first instance, to the abundance of unemployed capital lying idle with the great joint-stock banks, and the scarcity of sound investments in which the public could place money with confidence, after the default and embarrassments of the many foreign States. The banks, finding money forced on them, for which they were only required to pay small interest, generally only one per cent., and not finding a use for it in their regular discount and loan business, were led to invest it in rents and other good dividend paying securities. The next step was the formation of syndicates, or groups of banks and capitalists, for taking in hand particular stocks in which large profits were to be made at the expense of unwary sellers."

With the final result in the panic of 1882. With consequences, according to the *Globe-Democrat* of January 24th, 1882, as represented by the following extract from that paper:

"Cable dispatches announce that there are many suicides on the Continent in consequence of the panic on the Paris Bourse. Thousands of families are reported ruined. Suicides from financial losses appear to be more numerous in

[e] *Plutarch's Life of Tiberius Gracchus.*

Europe than in America,[f] for the reason that the losers are to a greater extent more dependent on their money alone for existence than they are in this country. Our losers generally know how to work, have more chances for occupation, and possess in general a greater recuperative power. The situation in France is one that shrewd observers have plentifully predicted. The speculative spirit there has been gradually rising for several years, and if the culmination has not been reached at present, it is probably only deferred for a comparatively short time." * * *

"According to the *Salut Public*, recent operations at the Bourse, in Lyons, have been of so exciting a character that many speculators have gone mad. 'Within a few days,' it says, 'so many lunatics were brought from the Bourse to one private mad-house that the director did not know how to dispose of them. His perplexity was all the greater because they fancied that they were still at the Bourse, and insisted on doing business with the other patients, and with the servants and officials. At last it occurred to the director to set up, in a remote part of his institution, a bar like that which is placed in the Bourse for agents. The effect on the patients was immediate; they rushed to the bar and began to invite each other to buy and sell. Thus the whole day passed; and not until evening, when they had exhausted themselves, would they consent to be taken to their rooms. Since that time the institution has been quieter, with the exception of the sham Bourse, where the lunatics daily win and lose milliards.' "—*New York Sun*, January 18th, 1882.

With the experience of France before us, we, in the United States, can see how little of permanent good we may expect from a sub-division of our large tracts of land, and breaking up of the old plantations, and will be safe in concluding that the articles and opinions we see daily in the

[f] Number of suicides in France in the year 1880 was 6,650; 74 per cent. of whom were males.

press, like the following from the *New York Herald*, of October 28th, 1881, are but dreams based only upon hope:

"SMALL FARMS.—The census returns make a very significant exhibit in many respects, one being the increase of small farms in the South which the latest returns make. In Alabama the number of holdings is 135,864 against 67,382 in 1870; Florida, 23,458 against 10,241; Georgia, 138,625 against 60,965, and South Carolina, 93,864 against 51,889.

'The *Boston Post* says this is not simply a gratifying increase, but a positively surprising record of growth. Many of these holdings are very small, but nevertheless they realize in the aggregate the success of multiplied instances of ambition for proprietorship. The general condition of industry at the South may be considered much more hopeful, judging from such data, than it is in the West. The best promise of a section is associated with many owners of the soil. Immense farms are becoming too common in the West. In the South small farms are the rule, and this fact will, in time, build up communities with the dependent classes very small. The new South is on the right course.'

"It would be more proper to say that small farms are becoming the rule in the South. The change from immense plantations to small farms is going on, and the work will be accomplished before a great while. There are still many of the large plantations remaining pretty much as they were twenty years ago, the main difference being they are not half worked. Much of the land is lying idle and growing up in bushes."

For, says the *Atlanta Constitution*, October 20th, 1882:

"About a year ago Messrs. Nelson, Barker & Co., representing Northern capital, established themselves in Atlanta and offered to lend money on farm lands. I met one of the firm yesterday, and he said:

'We have already loaned $1,000,000 on Georgia farms, and are now lending at the rate of about $100,000 a month.'

'What section of the State has borrowed most largely?'

'The southern. We have sixty-five land agents in Georgia, and the agents in Sandersville and Talbotton have loaned more money than any others. There is comparatively little money loaned on North Georgia farms. We continue to lend all that is wanted provided proper security is given. The demand remains about the same.'

"That sounds pretty bad, don't it? The farms of the State mortgaged for a million dollars, and new mortgages being recorded at the rate of one hundred thousand dollars a month! The interest paid on these loans is 8 per cent., but including commissions, etc., will run above 10 per cent. So that the farmers send through this one company $100,000 in interest every year, outside the State, and the interest account is increasing at the rate of $10,000 a month."

This statement will show us at what an alarming rate Southern farmers are imposing incumbrances upon their farms. And this system is in extensive operation in all the Southern and Western States. We cannot speak advisedly of the Eastern and the Middle States. And the above from the *Constitution* does not represent all the debts that are thus incurred by the farmers. Every city, town, and village, has its merchant who holds mortgages on a great number of the farms in his county. With good crops the farmer may meet the debts incurred for provisions, utensils, teams, etc. And may pay interest on such advances as they may have obtained. But when a bad season overtakes them, many cannot do this;—and the farm is sold; or the farmer is kept poor all his life paying interest on the original debt, and by paying excessive prices for the provisions, etc., that he may need for the future. For after his affairs become thus entangled, the farmer must thenceforth purchase from the merchant who holds the mortgage. And prices can be, and are, arbitrarily made, and the farmer cannot help himself;

if he would trade elsewhere the mortgage so long upheld would be at once foreclosed.

We venture the assertion that if every county in the Union would make correct returns of the amount of money annually borrowed on farms, and the number of farms either sold to pay such money borrowed, or that are so deeply involved as to make release in the future impossible, a most astonishing as well as alarming revelation would be made.

And the idea of Mr. Thad. Stevens of dividing the Southern plantations into forty-acre farms to be donated to the negroes, had it been carried into effect, would have produced no permanent good, for in this case, too, possession was based upon *ownership of soil.* And we may rest certain that the so-called hopeful signs of the inauguration of peasant proprietorships in the South will result, eventually, as it has resulted in France, and is now resulting in New England, in large estates. Read the following in this connection from the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*:

"Rural New England is held up to view as the last relic of paradise—a region in which Puritanism lingers, and every man is a Cincinnatus and every woman a Penelope or a Lucretia. But here is a letter in a Massachusetts paper from the county seat of one of these rustic parts which says that, 'a large majority of the loafers whom one sees in our villages, who get the drunkest, reel on the streets, and are easily distinguishable by their uncouth appearance and dress, with pants-legs inside their boots, come from the back or hill towns, and their home life is of the same grade. A drive through most of the towns will show scores of homes little better than huts, with tumble-down barns and fences, and the general surroundings on the same level. And yet the truly good people of these same towns probably contribute

some dollars every year to send 'Home Missionaries' to Missouri and other parts of the West."

Remember, now, that agriculture is the pursuit of two-thirds of the population of France. And bear in mind the increasing hoards of beggars and thieves that throng in Paris, and the other cities of France, and the six thousand annual suicides, which are also on the increase, and the reader can form his own answer to the question: would not small proprietors, based upon ownership of land, ultimately benefit our country?

Let him remember, also, that the descriptions given are of a country esteemed fortunate in its agricultural methods and results compared to England and Ireland. Let him remember that this is the description of a nation with a big N, and the oldest and farthest advanced in "civilization." Let him remember that this is a description of a country which, for the purpose of estimating the spread of religion and the number of Christians, makes the largest showing[g] in the Church's statistics. Let him remember that this is the condition of a country that has embraced Christianity longer than any country (excepting Italy) in Europe, and let him bear in mind that it is of this country, so long christianized, that Prof. Wooley is speaking, when he says, in his *recent* work on Socialism, "Even *now* it (!!) (Christianity) is showing its benign light to the Socialist of France," and he will be able to estimate how much reliance is to be placed upon the effects of Christianity to check the spread of socialistic ideas and the growth of poverty, or prevent a final catastrophe. And he may, also, estimate how much reliance we will be authorized to place in this Christianity

[g] Next to Russia.

to prevent us from following the same road France has so effectually trod, or its ability to help us when the inevitable crisis arrives. Says Schlegel, "the Roman State, however, Christianity was unable to save, even when it had become predominant and universal."[h]

[h] *Schlegel's Lectures on Modern History.*

CHAPTER XVI.

UNHAPPINESS ARISING FROM UNCONGENIAL PURSUITS.

And so did our peasant show himself among us; a soul like an æolian harp, in whose strings the vulgar wind, as it passed through them, changed itself into articulate melody. And this was he, for whom the world found no fitter business than quarreling with smugglers and vinters, computing excise dues upon tallow, and guaging ale barrels. In such toil was that mighty spirit sorrowfully wasted.—*Carlyle's Essay on Burns.*

Nothing is more conducive to happiness than the free exercise of the mind in pursuits congenial to it.—*Macaulay's Mitford's Greece.*

Gibbon thus describes the palaces and gardens of Zehra:

"Twenty-five years, and above three millions sterling, were employed by the founder; his liberal taste invited the artists of Constantinople, the most skillful sculptors and architects of the age; and the buildings were sustained or adorned by twelve hundred columns of Spanish or African, of Greek and Italian marble. The hall of audience was encrusted with gold and pearls, and a great basin in the center was surrounded with the curious and costly figures of birds and quadrupeds. In a lofty pavilion of the gardens one of these basins and fountains, so delightful in a sultry climate, was replenished, not with water, but with the purest quick-silver. The Seraglio of Abdalrahman, his wives, concubines and black eunuchs, amounted to six thousand three hundred persons, and he was attended to the field by a guard of twelve thousand horse, whose belts and cimetars were studded with gold."

And yet Gibbon relates that, notwithstanding all this wealth and grandeur, Abdalrahman exclaimed at the close of his life: "I have now reigned above fifty years in victory or peace, beloved by my subjects, dreaded by my enemies, and respected by my allies. Riches and honors, power and pleasure have waited on my call, nor does any earthly blessing appear to have been wanting to my felicity. In this situation I have diligently numbered the days of pure and genuine happiness which have fallen to my lot, they amount to FOURTEEN. O, man! place not thy confidence in this present world!"

And yet Gibbon, a private English gentleman, in commenting on this confession, says:

"If I may speak of myself, (the only person of whom I can speak with certainty,) *my* happy hours have far exceeded, and far exceed, the scanty numbers of the Caliph of Spain, and I shall not scruple to add, that many of them are due to the *pleasing labor* of the present composition."

This expression "pleasing labor," which Gibbon could use in speaking of his work, and which could find no place in the condition of a man occupying so unnatural a position as did Abdalrahman, explains the sorrowful exclamation of the one, and attests the sincerity of the declaration of the other.

And if to an eminence as exalted we find, occasionally, men in whom the desire to be good is pronounced, we find them also, like Solomon, exclaiming that "all is vanity!" While if the object of so much wealth and power happens to be a man of weak mind, the cares incumbent upon his position, the anxieties, the anticipations of plots, of assassination, of treason, or of a fall from power, will convert his previous amiability into jealousy, his complacency into

treachery, his weakness into cruelty. Thus, De Quincey, in explaining the wickedness of the Cæsars, says:

"Except, perhaps, in some chapters of Italian history, as, for example, among the most profligate of the Papal houses, and amongst some of the Florentine princes, we find hardly any parallel to the atrocities of Caligula and Nero, nor indeed was Tiberius much (if at all) behind them, though otherwise so wary and cautious in his conduct. The same tenor of licentiousness beyond the needs of the individual, the same craving after the marvelous and stupendous in guilt, is continually emerging in succeeding emperors—in Vitellius, in Domitian, in Commodus, in Caracalla—everywhere in short, where it was not overruled by one of two causes, either by original goodness of nature too powerful to be mastered by ordinary seductions (and in some cases removed from their influence by an early apprenticeship to camps), or by the terrors of an exemplary ruin immediately preceding. For such a determinate tendency to the enormous and the anomalous, sufficient causes must exist. What were they?" * * *

Among other reasons he gives this:

"Where, lastly, from such a population, and thus disciplined from his nursery days, we suppose the case of one invidual selected, privileged and raised to a conscious irresponsibility, except at the bar of one extra-judicial tribunal, not easily irritated, and notoriously to be propitiated by other means than those of upright or impartial conduct, we lay together the elements of a situation too trying for poor human nature, and fitted only to the faculties of an angel or a demon; of an angel, if we suppose him to resist its full temptations; of a demon, if we suppose him to use its total opportunities. Thus interpreted and solved, Caligula and Nero became ordinary men."[a]

[a] "Every friend to Augustus must have wished that the twelve years of his struggle might forever be blotted out from human remembrance. During the forty-two years of his prosperity and his triumph, being above fear, he showed the natural lenity of his temper."—*The Cæsars—De Quincey.*

A man who is very exalted in his rank and power cannot expect happiness unless his pursuit in life is also of a high order, and circumstances allow him to follow the inclinations of religious fervor, or patriotic zeal. In his country or his God—in these alone may a despot seek happiness—in these alone may a king find labor that will conduce to his contentment.

In a country where knowledge is generally diffused, a boy who may have made a good living by blacking boots will, in the course of time, have acquired an amount of general information, will have picked up, one way and another, an education that will sooner or later make him desire to enter other fields of industry. But if circumstances are such as will not permit his leaving his boot-blacking profession, he will be miserable in the pursuit of his accustomed labor in proportion as he has become educated, and in proportion as his success in his profession shall stimulate him to undertake greater enterprises in other lines, and shall have authorized him to expect success there also, and in proportion as these considerations shall induce him to enter another sphere of action, and as the money he has accumulated offers capital to carry out his new designs. But if, from circumstances, he is compelled to remain a boot-black, he will be unhappy, and will probably resort to underhanded means to accomplish his release from his no longer desirable occupation, or, from disgust, will become reckless and dissipated.

A man who, by force of circumstances, finds himself out of employment and out of money, may gladly accept the first position that promises to remedy these evils; and for a time, perhaps for years, the novelty of his new pursuit, present success, and the gildings of hope, may enable him cheerfully, perhaps enthusiastically, to fulfill the duties of

his position. But if he happens to be by nature a Clive, and the position he has accepted or secured be that of a clerk, the time will eventually arrive when he will become disgusted with his occupation. And that disgust will grow in proportion as accumulated means shall afford him a basis upon which to dream of the possibilities of a more congenial vocation, and in proportion as contact with the world shall have added to his store of ideas,or shall have increased the illustrations of his mind, and shall have demonstrated the feasibility of effecting his cherished schemes; and in proportion as, despite all these, he is compelled by circumstances to remain in his present situation. And these circumstances will be the reward of making a living, if he adheres to his present work, and the fear of not being able to sustain himself in the other pursuit; and also, the anticipated danger of not being able, through pressure of competition, to obtain his prior position again, should he desire to do so, upon finding himself unsuccessful in making a genteel livelihood in the pursuit of more congenial labor.

Therefore, with individuals, we find that good government, knowledge and wealth (competence) are not all that are necessary to produce happiness or promote virtue; and that while our triangle[b] rule will apply to nations in determining the degree of their civilization, of their happiness and virtue, as a whole, in the matter of individual man there is a fourth element necessary to be taken into consideration, and that fourth element is congeniality of occupation. But the liberty to seek congenial occupation can exist only in a limited degree as long as man is excluded, by being prohibited free access to land, from that pursuit most acceptable to the majority of the people of all nations, and as

[b]See *The Factors of Civilization, Vol. I., Chap. VII.*

long as competition, which is unfortunate in its consequences only because of this exclusion, forces him to accept the first opportunity offered to make a living, and keeps him there by fear of doing worse should he make a change. And this imprisonment will be greater as competition becomes more intense, as civilization shall add to his duties, and increases the number of the necessaries of life; and which civilization, based upon private ownership of land, must necessarily do with increase in population; and thus gradually will lessen his chances for re-occupation should he fail in what his nature prompts him to attempt as his peculiar and congenial work.

Were land free, while all men would not desire to become farmers, enough more would adopt this mode of making a living to allow those qualified, or desirous of doing other work, to select the work they were best qualified to do, or took most interest in doing.

Therefore, whenever we find these four conditions present in a man's surroundings: good government, education, competency, and congeniality of occupation, we will find the highest development of man towards virtue and happiness. Take, for instance, a physician, who, living in the United States, England or France, has a practice that insures him a living, and a residuum each year forming a sinking fund to provide against contingencies of time or accidents; take one who loves to practice his profession, and you will find a man who will be, for virtue and happiness, for pleasant and hearty geniality, in advance of his community. So with the lawyer whose heart is in his profession, and who, by the practice of his profession, secures a competency and provision against the future. Or, take our country clergymen, not the illiterate, narrow-

minded cranks, who rush from one extreme of absurdity to another, not one whose ignorance keeps him pondering over texts in the vain hope of reconciling previous conceptions and anterior conclusions with subsequent developments, but one with an education, and with a fund of general information up to the average of the educated of his time, give him a salary that insures him a reasonable share of the good things of the world, and with his heart enthused with the love of his work, he becomes a worthy exemplar in the practice of virtue, and, as an exponent of happiness, well deserving of the emulation of his parishioners.

And that this is not due to Christianity, or to the fact that he preaches rather than makes shoes, but is due to the more or less perfect combination of the four conditions we have designated, is proven by the double demonstration, that if we give a shoemaker the same conditions in his surroundings, the Divine fount within him will gush out in manifestations of equal goodness and gladness; or, if we curtail any one of the conditions predicated in the case of the clergyman beyond a certain extent, and make him a subject of persecution, make him narrow-minded and ignorant, or cut down his salary to a point of bare subsistence, how quickly the benevolent face wrinkles and grows sour!

The following extract from the church-news column of the *Globe-Democrat*, of July 17th, 1881, will bear us out in this conclusion:

"If there is anything in which old Satan especially delights it is to get after a minister of the gospel, attack him in liver, stomach or nerves, and give him an attack of the blue horrors. At a recent famous prayer-meeting a letter from a minister thus beset by Satan was read. It was in this wise: 'I am in a useful field, but I am poor in health, and of late I am troubled with melancholy and gloomy

doubts of my own salvation, which almost drive me to thoughts of suicide. Life is dark and unhappy, devotion is irksome and prayer gives no relief.' Curiously enough there were other letters in the same strain. The writers of these cheerless communications desired the prayers of the meeting, of which, or of some other beneficent agency, they seemed to be sorely in need. There are times when some of the best of people seem thus beset. They do not know exactly what is the matter with them, nor can they tell, with unerring accuracy, on whom to lay the blame. Sometimes they blame the church people, sometimes the things they have eaten, and sometimes Satan. If they are very humble persons they may even go so far as to blame themselves, although this is unusual. As no two men are exactly alike, so it is with the diversity of men's troubles. There is no use of stopping to blame anybody for these things. To do that is to spend time and to bring on worry in vain. Enough that the evil exists. The first thing to be done is to try to cure it. The prophet Elijah was once in just such a peck of troubles. He had been doing his work nobly and faithfully, and with a tremendous strain, both on his physical and mental powers. There came a crisis in which, after having achieved wonderful and victorious success, he ignominiously failed. A bad woman scared him out of his wits, and he was in as gloomy a mood as any of the dyspeptic clergymen who asked the prayers of the noon-day meeting. He wanted to die and be rid of himself. His boldness failed him and he ran away, far into the lonely desert. The Lord went after him and directed him to go to work again, hopefully and confidently, but first to take a long jaunt in the country. This long jaunt combined duty with pleasurable exercise. Elijah did as he was bid, and was restored to good spirits and usefulness. Probably some of these melancholy ministers want just such a change of scene and labor as Elijah had. We suspect they are country parsons on slim salaries. Well-fed city clergymen do not generally write from their comfortable parsonages such wails of misery. They have their vacations in summer time, and

can rest and take things easy. Many a poor country clergyman has no vacation at all. We know some who have plodded on for long years with only an occasional Sunday of holiday, and that only when they were too faint or too sick to preach or pray. It would be a blessed thing if this vacation business could be averaged among the rich and the poor—among the pastors of the steepled churches with the solid incomes, and those of the $800 salaries. But, whether rich or poor, big church or little one, every minister who expects to keep Satan at bay ought to have pay enough to keep himself and his family well fed, and to take an occasional relief from the constant round of making and preaching the same kind of sermons to a monotonously wearisome lot of uninterested hearers."

But the most convincing proof of our proposition is afforded by the study of the disposition of woman, as presented under various forms of civilization, and as the conditions we had mentioned are absent or present in her environments. The wives, daughters, mothers and sisters of the upper and middle classes in Europe, and in nearly all classes above the lowest in the United States, as a rule, are happier and more virtuous, more charitable and impulsive than the men. Why? Because, having husbands, fathers and brothers to provide for them, they have a competency assured; and, in consequence of not having to pull and twist, lie and cheat, trample or be trampled in the struggle for existence, they are more ingenuous and more truthful, and, in a word, more noble. And again, these in their home circle enjoy all the advantages to be derived from a congenial association and good government. They, too, have, on the whole, as good an education—that is, they have as much knowledge of such things as concern them—as the men of their class in the community. And, as wives, mothers, daughters or sisters, find in their home

duties occupations congenial, and bearing in the increased love and admiration of husbands, fathers, brothers, or sons, a rich reward; women in this condition are justly considered superior in "goodness," in sympathy, and other noble qualities, to the majority of the men in the same class.

Yet it is very doubtful if women have any greater natural capacity for "goodness" than men. Remove but one of these surroundings. Let them belong to those artificially constructed societies, called in ordinary parlance the "Upper Ten"; and, finding no scope for the exercise of individual talents or tastes, for their surperfluous energy to exercise itself upon, we have, in consequence, utter *ennui* and affectation, as in some of Mr. Mallock's sketches; or, from rich blood, high living, novel reading, fancy dances—a constant excitant to the animal passions that too often results in falls from virtue, intrigues, etc. If, however, we imagine the conditions supposed as restored, and, from a woman happy because thus circumstanced, we remove the factor knowledge, or education, we have evil results again following. If more ignorant than her companions or acquaintances, we will have as a result a morbid apprehensiveness of this fact by the woman, which will produce gloom and melancholy; or obstinacy and recklessness, with corresponding unhappiness to herself and family. Or we will have frivolity, which must always be in itself a cause of much unhappiness to the person herself from subsequent self-reproach, and often the cause of actions which directly or indirectly tend to unhappiness to herself[c] and pain and anxiety to others. Or, if we again restore all the conditions, and remove the factor, good government, in the place of a loving and intelligent guidance, let the head of

[c]See note e, page 63.

the family be tyrannical, whimsical, rough, or otherwise calculated by disposition or habit to render good government impossible, the result will again produce unhappiness. In this instance we may expect as a consequence, gloom, sadness, anger, remorse, and the unrest and anxiety and unhappiness that will arise from a constant conflict of antagonizing impulses. With a probable disruption of family ties in the line of least resistance, or the line of greatest attraction—the stage, or matrimony, or some other pursuit or action, will probably result.

And if to bad government we also add the factor ignorance, the results will be complicated evil, with speedier catastrophes. If now, restoring all the conditions, we remove only the factor, competence, we know what will follow. At first, a noble spirit will challenge the unequal conflict with the world, but eventually, as crowding cares constantly multiply and continue, sickness of heart will follow, with anxiety, and ultimate disgust or despair will result, which, if long continued, and fortune frowns too heavily upon the would be bread-winner, will eventually end in shame or suicide, or extreme religious devotion, and unhappiness and gloom will again result. Subtract with competency the factor education, and complicated evils will quickly follow. Remove now the element of good government, and the nature becomes hardened and more reckless. Remove now all congenial, legitimate pursuits, and the result will be a fiend or devotee, as chance or heritage, or education, may have determined—in either case unhappiness and gloom will follow.

And as we descend in the scale of society these evil results on character will be greater, until at last is produced the wild, blood-thirsty woman of the barricades. And if, to all this, we not only deprive this ignorant, loveless woman of

her right to be supported by the labor of man, but make her the laborer and drudge, we have the women of the savages, cruelest and fiercest, harder hearted than the men, just as this unnatural position of bread winner is, by nature of sterile soil, or from other causes, hardest to fill; among savages who occupy sterile lands, and who make their women do the work, the women are always the most debased and cruel.

But it may be said that this rule will not hold, for many men and women who in their lives have had all these surroundings, have neither been happy nor virtuous. Many gamblers and courtesans, for instance, have a fair amount of knowledge, enjoy all the blessings of good government, make a living by the practice of their profession, and, in many instances, their vocations are congenial to their (perverted) natures. It may be observed in the first place, in reply to this objection, that it is very doubtful if this class of people possess competence in the sense we understand it. For by competence we mean a sufficiency of wealth to obtain the civilization-rendered necessities of life, and to meet the wants of society, and to gratify the æsthetic aspirations to at least a proportionate extent. And, therefore, competency thus defined, must bear some close relation to a man's other surroundings or condition—primarily his education.

And, furthermore, we understand that this competence is the reward of work, and is to be secured by continuation of labor, and will be permanent and sufficient in proportion to the force and continuance of the labor exerted.

In this sense, then, the gambler does not possess competence; he may have great wealth for a time, but he is liable to have none whatever on to-morrow. And, at any rate,

the amount of his income, fluctuating and uncertain, can seldom bear any steady relation to his education, and is dependent more upon the uncertainties of chance than upon economy or industry, and therefore, is the cause of anxiety incompatible with happiness, and which by sudden fluctuations requires his attention, to the exclusion of all those ideas calculated to incite or promote virtue. And all this applies with much greater force to the vocation of the courtesan. And again, it is to be understood that all our predicted conclusions, in the matter of congenial occupations, are based upon work that adds to the sum of human happiness, or helps to supply the needs of man; work, to be able to produce a beneficent effect upon the worker, must possess this characteristic, or at least the worker must have an honest conviction that it fulfills this end, and that it is necessary, and a help, or a blessing to man.

This conviction the physician has, so has the lawyer, the editor, the school-teacher, the baker, the bootmaker, the railroad king, the stoker and the stevedore; but the gambler or the courtesan, the thief or the burglar, cannot convince themselves that their vocations are conducive to the sum of the happiness of man, or are needed to complete the perfection of the social structure. They may palliate, may excuse, may explain why they are as they are, but they do not, and cannot, pretend that they are necessary, and that they, by their work, accomplish good.

So we see that the objection does not hold, and that, so far at least the rule is good, that when the four conditions mentioned surround a man he will be happy and virtuous. Happy and virtuous in proportion as these surroundings are co-equal with each other; and in proportion as they shall all develop harmoniously, his happiness and virtue will increase

to the extent of his individual capacity. *This is* civilization. On a basis like this every advance promises but greater happiness and virtue; as all the necessary conditions endeavor to overtake the most advanced, and posterity shall inherit a constantly purified nature.

Again, however, it may be said that there are many men and women who in their lives possess all these conditions, and yet who, though full of good deeds and virtuous actions, of sympathy and love for their fellow men, are far from happy; notably may be instanced among men Carlyle and Ruskin, and of women George Eliot—of these it is certain that they were surrounded by all the conditions we have stated to be requisite for happiness and virtue.

Mr. Ruskin, for instance, lives in a country where government is practically as perfect as any that the world knows; possesses a considerable amount of wealth; has an education far above the average, and in his work "combines his special pleasure with his duty." (*Fors Clavigera.*) Yet Mr. Ruskin is certainly not a happy man. Thus the rule again appears to fail us, but in reality it does not. The more minutely it is examined the more complete it will be found.

We have seen in a previous chapter that when the other requisites for happiness and virtue were very meager or absent, and only knowledge was developed, much unhappiness would be the result. Thus with slaves, or the masses of the ignorant poor, to give them knowledge above their condition, that condition being fixed, either by statute enactments or industrial competition, was but to aggravate their unhappiness by enabling them more fully to comprehend their own unfortunate condition; was but to make them actively mis-

erable, when, before this knowledge had been imparted or gained, they may have been at least passively contented.

Now, with men like Ruskin, Carlyle, Emerson, and Wendell Phillips, and, possibly Mr. Bennett (we can only account for his reported morbid melancholy in this way), when these conditions are fulfilled and the result is not happiness, it proves only that they owe this unhappiness to the very fact of their development. As the highest mountains are the first to catch and reflect the light when the day is bright and clear, are also the first to become dark and gloomy when the skies are overcast with clouds, their souls have, by the union of these conditions, become so developed, so sensitivized, that they all the more readily catch and reflect the sorrows of others. And instead of being, as they should be, the lightest-hearted and most happy of men, they become sad and melancholy in proportion to their depth and earnestness of character—miserable in proportion as they are good.

"I simply cannot paint, nor read, nor look at minerals," says Ruskin, "nor do any thing else that I like, and the very light of the morning sky, when there is any—which is seldom now-a-days near London—has become hateful to me, because of the misery that I know of, and see signs of when I know it not, which no imagination can interpret too bitterly."—*Fors Clavigera.*

Hence, then, to insure happiness and virtue to all, it is only necessary to adopt a basis for our political economy that will enable every man who chooses to work to obtain a competency as the reward of his labor. And in the same way that civil rights and liberty have become common, in the same way that education is becoming more and more the property of all, so the tendency of competency will be in a like direction, and consequently there will be a

greater development in each man of all these conditions. Then will each individual, however humble, constitute one of a happy world, graduated by natural talent, limited only by extent of industry and frugality, and individual capacity, but every one happy in his degree.

And then will we open our eyes to the fact that heaven is in progress of formation even here on the bosom of our beneficent mother Earth, under the skies whose contemplation will only fill our minds with bright and happy anticipations of a future that will await us when we have learned all that it is necessary we should know here. Then will we become convinced that God indeed reigns, and is a bright, beneficent and bountiful Deity, whose endeavor it is to complete His work from the foundations—upwards; who desires that happiness shall be the lot of His children while they are preparing themselves by the acquisition of knowledge, and growth of love for higher duties, brighter existences, and grander destinies.

Then will we realize that religion is a consequence and not a cause. And that when the before mentioned conditions are fulfilled, religion will be the result, and that it will grow in beauty and strength in proportion as liberty, knowledge, and freedom from poverty shall develop and become common, and in proportion as *these in developing shall attain and preserve a symmetrical relation to each other.*

For religion is that instinct which seeks expression in acts which we feel to be beneficial to man and pleasing to God It is an instinct that has long been recognized by others besides Christians. It is this desire that Epictetus terms "the divine flame;"[d] it is this instinct and attribute that Mr.

[d]Recognizing this higher part; this spirituality of man, the noble Pagan, Seneca, exclaimed: "Let us therefore forgive one another."

Harrison recognizes when he says: "The spiritual sympathies of man are undoubtedly the highest part of human nature and our (positive) method condemns as loudly as any system physical explanations of a spiritual life."[e]

It is this diviner part of us that makes youth so beautiful and interesting; and it is this God-like attribute that adverse physical and intellectual surroundings change into calculation, cynicism and flippancy—and it is this rudimentary instinct that Theology in its efforts to train has almost obliterated. Acting on the principle that "the way the twig is bent the tree is inclined" each sect or denomination has "bent" this instinct to suit *a priori* ideas until, in place of a uniform and growing loveliness of generosity, ingenuousness, faith, hope and love, ugliness and rancor, sorrow and bitterness have been the result.

In place of surrounding human nature, the noblest product of God's greatest work, with those conditions that would enable it to grow and bring forth fruit, as a result of natural development, we have been training and cutting, trimming and "bending" until, instead of natural products, we have a medley of 'beliefs' and creeds and churches, that furnish in their motley articles and principles, and conflicting interests and precepts, the strongest possible argument against the necessity for any religion, or the existence of good. Like some Chinese garden, where the shrubbery is all trained and trimmed in accordance with the fantastic imaginations of each gardener, in our efforts to make Theology a guide and a trainer, we have departed in every instance from that noble result which God and nature intended. And the result is an artificial product, which like the peacocks, beasts, and

[e] "The Soul and a Future Life," in *A Modern Symposium.*

other whimsicalities of the gardens referred to, are directly opposite to the efforts and designs of nature, offensive to good taste, and which in no case can be esteemed beautiful except by a mind perverted by false education, and by a shallow culture, vitiated by traditions or ignorance.

We now see how much depends upon the affirmative solution of the question, shall the lands be free?

Will they be free? Let but the enthusiasm of humanity and the love of God touch our souls, and the answer will be—yes! Let us but once cast cold calculation to the breeze, and for once exert ourselves in a cause that promises so much, and which if we do not quickly decide on in the affirmative, will soon be decided for us, and perhaps by force.

In making this decision no man is called on to sacrifice a dollar. The total of indebtedness we may incur by purchasing the lands, amounts to nothing, as we have hundreds of years to re-collect it by levying a land tax that will not be felt by the people, and which will enable us to discharge every dollar of debt we may thereby incur.

We will not be called upon to take one law from our statutes, the protections to society will, in every particular, be the same; we will retain our police, and our constables, our judges and gallows as now, and the necessity to work will be the same. By the adoption of this measure we will ultimately render the use of judges and jailers unnecessary. But these, and all other safe-guards that society has invested itself with, can retain their positions until society has accustomed itself to the new order of things, has settled upon its firm and solid foundations.

And let it be noted by those who think they see in the suggestions offered an opening for general thriftlessness, who have an idea that most men will only work under pressure

of necessity, that, with the adoption of the plan herein proposed, the necessity for work will remain the same. There will be no means then, anymore than at present, for a poor man to acquire money or competence other than by labor.

The adoption of the new system would, however, give us this great gain over our present system—it would insure zest on the part of the workers, and would thus guarantee industry, whereas, under present circumstances, the majority of men only work because of necessity; then, they would have, in addition to the same necessity, the stimulus of hope and the encouragement of success.[f]

To argue that, under the proposed conditions, men would not work, is very much as if, seeing a man eat dry bread all his life, from the necessity of prolonging his life, or from the demands of hunger, we were afraid to change his diet, refused to give him steak and coffee, butter and rolls, for fear that the desire to live would no longer prompt, or the cravings of appetite no longer tempt him to eat.

The same necessity would exist in either case, only in the latter, pleasure and happiness, geniality and benevolence, enthusiasm and skill, would be promoted and sustained, while as now, craftiness, hardness, sourness, stinginess, and slouch work are the result of the struggle for existence.

It is as natural for a man to work as it is for him to eat. We may be certain that the same Providence who took the

[f] "The habitual poverty of the country people had given rise to maxims well calculated to keep them poor. Richelieu, in his Political Testament, says: 'If the people were well off, it would be difficult to restrain them within legal bounds.' Rulers in the eighteenth century did not go quite so far, but they believed the peasant would not work without the spur of need; misery appeared to them the only safeguard against idleness."—*The Old Regime and The Revolution, De Tocqueville, p.* 159.

necessary steps to insure, by implanting appetite in man for food, the continuation of man in the world, has not overlooked the necessity of implanting within him an instinct that would propel him towards the fulfillment of his destiny, for which only it was desirable that he should have been created.

A man confined to prison fare will only eat when necessity demands, and then as sparingly as possible. So a man confined to uncongenial work will do as little of it as possible, and will skimp and shirk work of this nature that is presented to him as much as he can, not to forfeit his wages and endanger his place, with bad results, in consequence, both to his employer and to himself. But give man congenial labor to do and he will work for the pleasure he obtains through work.[8] And work at congenial labor will keep his mind alive and stimulate it, and he will be constantly seeking fresh channels in which to exercise his ingenuity and in-

[8] "Modern progress has drawn even Naples and the Lazzaroni within its magic circle, and an accomplished traveler* expresses doubts of their alleged unconquerable laziness, for he had seen them work, wear clothes, sleep at home, earn money when they had a chance, and conduct themselves very much like other people. Perhaps, as with the Irish, a want of fair remuneration may be at the root of their idleness."—*Sanger's History of Prostitution*, p. 165.

"The boat on which Dr. Durbin passed through the lakes (of Ireland) was manned by a fine, full-chested, noble crew, with bright eyes and ready tongues. He says his heart bled for them toiling so willingly for ten pence a day."—*Henry Howe's Celebrated Travelers.*

"The Burman character differs in many points from that of the Hindoos and other East Indians. They are more lively, active and industrious, and though fond of repose, are seldom idle when there is an inducement for exertion."—*Malcom's Travels*, p. 187.

Describing the Peasantry of Russia, the author of "*The Member From*

Rome by a New Yorker, 1845.

dustry; thus at the same time, he will be producing a result, acquiring a competency, confirming industrious habits, improving his own character, shaping his interest, tranquilizing his mind, and, not being subject to irritations of an unwholesome nature, he will not seek relief in unwholesome stimulants. He will diffuse happiness through his own family circle, and add one to the industrious, religious and intellectual sum of humanity. It is only unhealthy organisms that eat, sleep or take exercise, from a *sense of duty*. The healthy man does these for the pleasure these things afford—the good results obtained by an occasional "constitutional," when pursued for the reward it promises, *follow* naturally and universally when the same thing is done for its own sake, and without reference to the reward, or to an ulterior object thereby to be obtained.

The Gauls, in defense of their country, set fire to their homes, and, destroying all the property that they could

Paris," in his work, *The Russian of To-Day*, says: "He would work for fair wages if it were offered him; he would even accept a hint about planting those potatoes and turnips if he was furnished with the seed and assured that he might eat the produce when it came up, but he has a shrewd sort of notion that if he bettered his lot overmuch by labor he would draw upon himself the attentive eye of the tax gatherer. This exacting official, the exciseman, the land agent from whom the cottage is rented, the peripatetic Jew from Odessa, from whom money has been borrowed—all seem to be in a league to pocket the mujick's earnings; and what little remains when they have all had their share, the parish priest begs the biggest half."

"The mountaineers of the Abruzzi, long infamous as banditti, (a stigma affixed by the French or other dominant powers on those who resist their rule,) in harvest time brave the deadly malaria of the Campagna to earn a few *liri* honestly for their starving children, although in so doing the many that never return to their mountain homes show the risks that all have run."—*Sanger's History of Prostitution*, *p.* 168.

not remove, fled to their forests to continue from their impenetrable shades their struggles against the invaders of their land.

The South, in fighting for a principle, lost billions of dollars, had her homes burned to the ground, her old men and women forced to become refugees, her sons slain by thousands.

The North, fighting for an idea, spent billions of money, and offered thousands of lives on the altar of the Union and Humanity. Think of the enthusiasm that has been wasted with such poor returns. Let but our hearts be touched with this enthusiasm, and our next exertion will accomplish the dreams of all the ages, will render actual the highest conception of the imagination. We will realize the hopes and the prayers of all the departed good, all the sages of the past;—will anticipate all the glories of the promised millenium!

Reader, we have now concluded our task, and in taking leave of you, we only ask the same charity in judging our motive that we have extended to all the world. The purpose of this book has been to establish the fact that the nature of man is good[h] until it is made otherwise by circumstances, to show what those circumstances are, and how they pervert his nature. To prove that the natural tendency of man is to progress upwards; and, that as man has emerged from ignorance, this tendency is revealed,[i] but that the very systems of education, religion, government, and politi-

[h]See *The Factors of Civilization, Vol. I, Chap. V.*

[i]Observation has proved that a medium state of refinement is accompanied with the least immorality, and that it is among the merest savages and the most highly polished communities that the greatest profligacy exists."—*Sanger's History of Prostitution, p.* 385.

cal economy, which he had recourse to in his days of ignorance, after a certain progress, check that advance, and produce disastrous results, such as stagnation, poverty, and consequent iniquity, because of bad government in the East, or poverty, and profligacy, and re-occurring catastrophes, because of bad systems of political economy in European civilization.[j] The presentation of the subject we are aware is faulty, and the arguments, in many instances, incomplete, but we have written, guided by the principle that each reader will comprehend our purpose, and that his own mind will supply many links that are missing in the argument. And as this book is written to serve no party purpose, nor to further any personal aim, perfect frankness is pre-supposed to exist between the writer and his readers.

If circumstances permit, we hope to write the "Analysis of Happiness," sometime in the future, and it is believed that this proposed work will help to make the present one more complete and more satisfactory.

[j] "It is certain that great expansion of pauperism did not exist in the ancient world. A pauper population is a disease peculiar to the modern or Christian world."—*De Quincy's, Greece Under the Romans.*

APPENDIX.

If a people or tribe are ignorant, and have no settled form of government, their chances to become civilized, independent of outside influences, will depend on their physical surroundings, and these surroundings will alike prove fatal to development of government, and acquisition of knowledge, if they are very favorable to the acquisition of such wealth, food, raiment and houses, as their ignorance makes alone essential to their happiness, or so unfavorable as to render the obtaining of these necessaries very difficult.

For, if the circumstances are very favorable, the ingenuity and industry of man are not called into action, and without action of these there can be no development of intelligence, no attainment of knowledge. And man, finding ready to his hand all the necessities of life, will subside into laziness and intellectual inertia. For in his condition of ignorance he feels no desire for the higher wants of life.

And this result will be intensified, and this condition stereotyped, if the climate, in addition to making labor unnecessary, will by its warmth be the cause of lassitude or conducive to repose.

Thus we understand the cause of the stationary position the savages in some of the South Sea Islands had for so long maintained; for nature being very bountiful, the necessity for labor or exertion was precluded, and the climate was calculated to produce idleness.

On the other hand, the same result of non-development will follow the extreme niggardness of nature, which, be-

cause of an ungrateful soil or other physical causes, requires that man devote all his time in the effort to sustain existence. And the consequence of extreme poverty will be aggravated if the climate is so cold as to confine man for much of his time to his cave or hut.

The only faculty that can become developed under these circumstances is the imagination; and mythology, poetry, or religion alone of the products of the mind become at all developed. And of course the mythology, religion, or poetry developed under these circumstances will be crude in finish, sensual, awful or ferocious, in conception and coloring, as the physical aspects of nature, or the wars of the tribe, shall impress the imagination or pervert the nature of man.

It will thus be seen that an acquaintance with Mr. Buckle's analysis of the influence upon man of climate, soil, and the physical aspects of nature, in promoting civilization, is necessary to those who desire to know upon what ultimate causes and combinations of causes civilization depends. By the study of his great work, "*History of Civilization in England*," we can ascertain how it occurred that the sense of personal liberty was such a characteristic of the "Barbarians" of Germany. Unfortunately, having adopted the current theories of political economy, Mr. Buckle's efforts at unriddling the enigma of ages has been only in part successful.

And Mr. Bagehot, in his work, "*Physics and Politics*," has thrown little, if any, light on the subject of the cessation of progress that has characterized many nations, and the decay of many others. His "cake of custom" is simply the announcement of a fact, as to why customs should cake,

his conjectures, to say the least, are far from satisfying to a critical inquirer.

Prof. Henry George, in his invaluable work, "*Progress and Poverty*," has, in our opinion, found the solution of the problem. But as Mr. George's work is mostly devoted to the examination and refutation of the received theory of political economy,[a] he has not given that attention to the causes of the development of nations which are so essential to be known before we can form correct ideas of what elements of progress are necessary to produce a given result. And while it is not our intention, if we were equal to such an undertaking, to go into an exhaustive analysis of these causes and their relations to each other, yet as we have formulated a rule[b] for the determination of happiness and virtue in nations, it is desirable in order that that rule may be intelligently applied, that some remarks be made as to what is to be understood by a "perfect government," by "liberty," and by "knowledge." If in the course of that explanation any light should be thrown upon the defectiveness of the polity, or the educational method, of the past, so much the better. We hope, however, that in any event, what we will have to say will have the effect of making it clear to the general reader that not only must any civilization, that expects to be permanent and constantly progressive, be founded upon liberty, education and competence, but that these factors must be characterized by certain conditions, before they may be said to fulfill the idea that their names are supposed to convey.

[a] And for the complete refutation of the received theories of political economy his work is invaluable. And a close study of this work is earnestly recommended to all, especially to the young men of America.

[b] See *the Factors of Civilization, Vol. I. Chap. VII.*

The civilizations that most attract the attention of the modern student are those of Greece and Rome. By no nations of a previous or subsequent date have the rights of citizens been more clearly defined, or the persons of citizens more respected.[c] Nor does the British constitution, nor the American constitution, allow more personal liberty to the citizens of their respective nations than did those of Athens and Rome during their days of highest development.[d]

But we are not to infer from this fact that, supposing education and competence had existed in equal degree, the Romans and Grecians would have been universally virtuous or universally happy. For, while the *idea* conveyed by the word "citizen" was as complete as any meaning it has since attained, the *application* of the idea was deficient and restricted. The rights that were enjoyed by a citizen of early Rome or Greece, were rights that were recognized only in Rome or Greece, and were accorded to him solely because he was a Roman or a Grecian. A citizen of Great Britain enjoys all the personal liberty in the United States that a citizen of this country does. He has not all the rights, such

[c] "If the ideal happiness of man is to be found in a polity which, with a strict enforcement of the law gives fullest scope to the tastes, fancies and peculiarities of each citizen, then, unless the historian has wholly misrepresented the orator, Athens in the days of Perikles approached nearer to this ideal than we approach it now." *Cox's Gen'l Hist. of Greece*, *p.* 280.

[d] "All the special characteristics of English polity, its freedom of speech, the right of the people to govern themselves, the supremacy of the ordinary courts of law over all functionaries without exception, the practical restriction of State interference to the protection of person and property, the free play given to the tastes, fancies, prejudices and caprices of individual citizens, may be seen in equal development in the polity of Athens." *Cox's Gen'l Hist. of Greece*, *p.* 70.

as the privilege of voting, etc., but as these are rights that he takes little interest in possessing, exclusion from them is not felt as a privation.

This is one difference between the ancient idea of citizen and the modern. The Greeks and the Romans, because of their religious conceptions and their early conflicts with adjacent tribes, came to look upon all men outside of their respective countries as natural enemies, and this idea, which prevailed for so long with the common people of England and France, was accepted and lingered in Rome until after the conquest of Greece by the Romans.

From Greece, Roman philosophers first caught a glimpse of the truth that there ought to be such a thing as a citizen of the world, that there was a tie that should unite all men in a common brotherhood. And this noble conception that Rome owed to Greece, Greece owed to acquisition of knowledge, knowledge obtained by travel and association with the philosophy of the East. That is to say, it was one of the results that followed because of contact with Egyptian civilization and the conquest of Asia by Alexander the Great.

And it was from these causes that speculation first began to assume a practical turn in Europe. Prior to either event the philosophy of Greece was directed in abstract metaphysical channels, that could have but little influence on Greek estimation of Greeks, or of nations not Greek. But intercourse with the "Barbarians" of Persia and Egypt enlarged the minds of Greek philosophers, and then the idea of a common humanity first dawned upon Europe.

In the same way, and from the same cause, the result of the Crusades was to enlarge the minds of the one-ideaed fanatics that thronged to the conquest of the Holy Land.[e]

[e] "From these expeditions, extravagant as they were, beneficial consequences followed, which had neither *been foreseen nor expected.*"—*Robert-*

And from that day to this, the idea of citizen has been developing towards a fuller meaning than that in which it was understood in the days of Numa or Pisistratus. It now conveys a claim to the consideration of other nations besides our own country.

To the very natural animosity to all foreigners that characterized the Romans and the Greeks was due the slavery of the conquered. There was no moral compunction or sense of sin attending this action. It was simply a question whether the captive should be killed or made a slave, and self-interest pronouncing for slavery, slavery was his doom.

In another essential particular was the application of the rights of citizenship defective. It not only excluded all persons not of the particular nation, but it was restricted to a part only of the residents of the nation—to the founders of Rome and Greece. These were the land-owners and their descendants, and it was only sparingly, and at a later date, that those who were not land-owners or the descendants of land-owners, were admitted to this citizenship.[r] The consequence was the formation of three classes in society: 1st. The land-owners. 2nd. The descendants of land-owners, who owned no land themselves. 3rd. The slaves. The first class, who constituted the governing body, possessed:

1st. Liberty, deficient as we have shown.

2nd. Competence, derived from rent of land.

3rd. Knowledge; but of a kind of no practical importance

son's History of the Middle Ages, p. 16. "The followers of the Cross marched through countries better cultivated and more *civilized* than their own."—*Idem.*

[r] "At the period of the greatest liberality in her constitution, not more than one-sixth of all the subjects of republican Rome had so much as a theoretical right to participate in the governing power."—*Montesquieu's Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans—note by the translator, p.* 178.

in teaching them how best to increase by legitimate means their competence, or how to perfect their political organization. Consequently the results were pernicious—which results manifested themselves in tyrannical measures of repression, and unscrupulous schemes of ambition.

The second class possessed:

1st. Liberty; as, before shown, deficient in scope.

2nd. Competence, because of being State beneficiaries.

3rd. Knowledge; but which, being subject to the same defects as shown above, produced bad results,—plots, conspiracies and tumults; and idleness, and the ills that flow from idleness, because they were supported by the State.

The third class, who were the slaves, possessed of liberty none, of competence, however, to the extent of food and clothing, they were assured because they were slaves; of knowledge, none.

Thus outlined we are enabled to see at once the defectiveness of Roman and Greek societies. Now, we have seen how the idea of citizenship was enlarged in its scope in one direction,[8] when did it become sufficiently enlarged to embrace the slaves also? Not until after the union of the Germanic ideas of personal rights with the Greek and Roman

[8]If we are in error in saying that the Roman idea of liberty became more extended and refined by contact with and absorption of Grecian philosophy, subsequent to the invasion of Asia by Alexander, and, instead, adopt the conclusion on this subject of Baker, it only goes to prove the power of the unfettered mind to reach an altitude of conception, by innate strength, which we, wishing to be conservative, had considered to be a result attained only under given circumstances, in this instance by knowledge acquired by examination of more ancient civilization, and by closer intimacy with peoples before considered barbarians.—See for Baker's views his note to Chap. xx. of his translation of *Montesquieu's Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans.*

idea of political right; not until the union of the spirit of personal independence, with Roman law, did the idea of citizen gravitate towards perfection.

And now if we turn our attention to the civilization of England, to further illustrate the other difference in the idea of liberty, besides the difference we have already alluded to, we find that it was after this union of Roman jurisprudence with the democratic institutions and traditions of the barbarians, that the sense of wrong inflicted by the existence of slavery first manifested itself. And these units of civilization uniting, they coalesced, and developing, produced the idea of slavery being in opposition to the rights of man; and as soon as this conviction took possession of men's minds there were found those who advocated manumission as a duty. But that this sense of duty did not arise because of Christianity, but from developed natural virtue, is proved by the fact that even under the old Grecian societies, "some there were, both among the oligarchs and among the unfranchised people, in whom the sense of law seemed almost intuitive; men who were animated by the conviction that law is an eternal power, being the expression of divine righteousness."[h]

And that this result was not accomplished until after Europe had been Christianized more than a thousand years.

It was not until the extravagances of the leaders of the Crusaders, the lords, dukes and earls who led these swarms of zealots, had involved themselves so heavily in debt that they began to confer charters upon the towns and cities subject to them,[i] and then these charters were confer-

[h] *Cox's General History of Greece, p.* 41.

[i] "Though the institution of communities was as repugnant to their maxims of policy, as it was adverse to their power, they disregarded remote consequences in order to obtain present relief. In less than two

red for money to enable them to continue their Quixotic adventures, or to replenish their purses on their return to their native land. It was to the increased power of the monarchs of the different kingdoms that liberty, as applied to others than land-owners or their descendents, became the heritage of the common people of Europe.

For these monarchs, "none of whom had engaged in the first Crusade, eagerly seized this opportunity of annexing considerable territories to their crown at small expense." It was, therefore, to the origin of the communes and the growing power and importance of the cities which the monarchs fostered to strengthen themselves against their turbulent barons, that we owe the initial freedom of the

centuries servitude was abolished in most of the towns in France, and they became free corporations, instead of dependent villages without jurisdiction or privileges. Much, about the same period, the great cities in Germany began to acquire like immunities, and laid the foundation of their present liberty and independence. The practice spread quickly over Europe, and was adopted in Germany, Spain, England, Scotland, and all the other feudal kingdoms."—*Robertson's History of the Middle Ages, p.* 21.

"And, as is also shown by the fact, that the practice of emancipating slaves in Rome had become so general, that Augustus made laws to prevent the emancipation of too many. The wealthy class of Rome, influenced by generosity, avarice or weakness, emancipated them in great numbers. Some desired to reward faithful slaves; the motive of others was to obtain, in the name of their emancipated slaves, the grain which the Republic distributed to poor citizens." etc.—*Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans—Montesquieu—p. p.* 266-267.

We may note, in passing, that in those countries where necessity or interest did not compel manumission, Christianity encouraged slavery and Christians owned slaves, as in North and South America, after the period alluded to above, and in Russia; and that emancipation of the agricultural slaves in Europe did not occur until the twelfth century.

people from feudalism and serfage, and not to Christianity.[1]

And in the northern portions of our own country, the same reasons existed (in great measure) that made the idea of slavery hateful to the people of old England. And their natural desire to fulfill a duty, meeting with no resistance from self-interest—for the climate and the soil of the Eastern States rendered slavery, on a large scale, unprofitable—and knowledge developing faster than in the South, the spread of free thought enabled men to see the iniquity of the practice, in spite of the teachings of the Bible and the example of the ancients. Therefore, the idea of slavery became sooner obnoxious to the people of the East than to those of the South, and, hence, from these reasons, the agitation of the slavery question arose in the East.

In the South, on the other hand, while the inheritance from Rome, Greece and the Barbarians was the same, the same result of antagonism to the system was not produced because of several reasons that obtained in the South but which were absent in the North.

First, was the obstacle of supposed self-interest. The population being sparse, and the soil and climate admitting the use of slaves with profit to their masters, the institution soon became so fixed that the ownership of land and slaves became the criterion of gentility and of aristocracy. Hence, every man, as quickly as he could, purchased land and slaves. Thus, in a few years, all the intelligence of the South, represented by the descendants of the original European land-owners, and all the energy and the enterprise of

[1] The church in France "owned serfs at a time when no other seigniors did."—*The Old Regime. De Tocqueville, p.* 46. See, also, note C, p. 84, this volume.

the South, represented by those originally not "gentlemen," but who had contrived to amass money—were alike interested in the continuation of that institution which secured wealth and prestige to both.

Second, was the obstacle presented by continuity of effect.

It was not immediately after the sale or emancipation of the slaves of the North that the abolition movement began. There was a break between the two occurrences; and in this interspace the natural instincts of man had, in the North, time to harden into convictions. In the South, there being no break of this nature, but the system having been in ceaseless operation since the introduction of slaves, the natural instincts of man were not allowed to unite into convictions adverse to slavery.

Again, a cause for the difference was the scarcity of the slave-holders in the East to the multitude of the non-slave-holders in a population that was comparatively very dense. The interchanging of ideas, facilitated by contiguity of homes, among that *majority* who, while on *a par with those who did own slaves were not slave-holders themselves*, soon produced a public opinion that was powerful to produce emancipation or sale of slaves by the *minority*.

In the South, the planters living miles apart, and all being slave-owners, and the only non-slave-owners being the uneducated "poor whites," there was no foundation of *public opinion, other than that formed by the slave-owners themselves.*

Still another, and a very powerful cause of the continuation of slavery in the South longer than in the North, is to be found in the superior orthodoxy of the South.[k] Compare

[k] Since writing the above we have read a work from which we extract the following: Says Mr. John Lawrence: "After having seen how slaves originated, and what it is in theory and practice, it may seem use-

the number of different sects in the South with the number that existed in the North and East prior to the war, and it will be found that the diversity of sects was much greater North than South. And this being so, it followed that in the South, as in all other countries, the bad institutions of the country existed longest in those most *orthodoxly* religious. Having now attempted to set forth the meaning that must attach to the word citizen before "liberty" can be predicated as existing in a perfect condition in any country, the reader must bear in mind the fact that, in applying the guage of liberty in determining the happiness of a people, the word liberty does not constitute a complete side of the triangle until this full sense of the word has been attained.

And this survey enables us to see at a glance how defective, in this important particular, was the civilization of Greece and Rome, even in their brightest eras; and will also enable us to see, that had not the union of the Germanic idea with the Roman taken place, we, in all probability, would never have possessed liberty in the fullest sense.

If the inquiry is made why the Germans should have

less, if not impious, to inquire seriously whether a system so manifestly unjust, cruel and diabolical is sanctioned in the Bible; but the confidence with which slave-holders and their apologists quote it in defense of slavery, and the recklessness with which it is denounced by a class of *infidel* (italics ours) abolitionists, impels us to enter into this inquiry."—*The Slavery Question, p.* 91, Dayton, O., 1857.

And on page 167 the same writer says: "From this review it will be perceived that the most influential denominations have given their sanction to slavery. They have opened wide their doors to slave-holders, and have welcomed them to their communion. They have not advised nor commanded them to emancipate their slaves as a condition of admission to the church, to the Lord's table, to the pulpit, or even into heaven itself."

possessed this sense of personal independence rather than the Romans or Greeks, we can only refer the inquirer to Buckle's analysis of the influence on man of the physical aspects of nature, and to Schlegel's remarks on Germanic scenery and climate, and to the remark of Mr. Cox, the historian: "The foundation of all Grecian societies was laid in an intense selfishness," owing to the constant struggle for existence with neighboring tribes, which struggles, because of the size of the country occupied, were incessant. And hence arose the hatred and jealousy of all other nations that characterized societies in ancient Greece and Rome, and the subordination of the individuals to the State, necessitated by the perpetual strife and dangers.[l]

In taking into consideration another one of the predicated constituents, whose presence or absence is essential to produce happiness or, calculated to create unhappiness, education,[m] the same method of analysis will enable us to see,

[l] And in answer to the question that may occur to the reader, why the Greeks should possess knowledge rather than the Germans, and to have been more inquisitive in inquiry, and more bold in speculation, the following extract from "*The Greeks and the Persians*" (Rev. G. W. Cox-M. A.,) is submitted as an answer: "There was, in fact, only one circumstance which kept the Greeks from remaining on a level with the half civilized or wholly savage tribes of Thrace or Epeirus (Epirus). Not only were they everywhere within reach of the sea, but in a country less in area than Portugal, they had a seaboard equal in extent to that of Portugal and Spain together," etc.—See p. 20.

See also Chapter II, Vol. II, *Draper's Intellectual Development of Europe*, "Greece," says M. Ernest Renan in his article, "The Religions of Antiquity," "owes nothing, save to its gods, its seas, its skies and its mountains." And he might have added, to the Phoenicians.

[m] "Thus, in China and India, the right basis of political economy being acted upon despite the ignorance of the Hindoos and the Chinese, and despite their despotic form of government, there is less suffering among the

first, wherein the education of Greece and Rome was defective, and second, what features must characterize education ere we can expect good results to follow upon its presence.

In all that pertained to art, or purely speculative metaphysics, the Greeks excelled. It was not until about 300 years B. C., that they turned their attention in any considerable degree to experimental philosophy. And the fruits to mankind that these studies were calculated to bestow, mankind was prevented in many important cases from receiving, by the breaking up of the Macedonian Empire, and

poor (population being considered) than exists in England, Ireland, or Italy.* The superiority of Chinese civilization to that of India is explained by the fact that learning is more common and held in higher estimation in China than in India. But that no greater results in civilization are attained in China than has been attained, is explained by the *form* of government referred to *and* the imperfect system of education pursued. Thus Mr. Davis tells us that "the actual state of the sciences in China may, perhaps, be ranked with their condition in Europe some time previous to the adoption of the inductive method in philosophy," and that "they profess to set no value on abstract science, apart from some obvious and immediate end of utility."—*China and the Chinese, Vol. I, p.* 252.

And, says Mr. Morrison, the object of the government in making education general, is not to extend the bounds of knowledge, but to impart the knowledge already possessed to as large a portion as possible of the rising generation, "and to pluck out true talent from the mass of the community for its own service. * * * It prescribes the books to be studied, a departure from which is *heterodoxy*, and discountenances all innovations that do not originate with itself."—*China and the Chinese, Vol. I, p.* 275.

*"Distressing as are the sights of mendicity in Canton, they are less so than I have seen in some other cities, especially Dublin and Turin, and almost all are either blind or evidently sick, which is far from being the case in Ireland or Italy."—*Malcom's Travels, Vol. I, p.* 151.

the conquest of Greece by Rome—and the subsequent ascendency of Monkish and Patristic literature and philosophy.

In another respect was the education of the Greeks and the Romans defective—in history—not history as history was written as late as the nineteenth century; but his tory that inquired into and explained the results of actions and deeds, as well as recorded those actions and deeds themselves,—history which, in the words of Macaulay, takes cognizance of the fact "that the happiness of the many commonly depends on causes independent of victories or defeats, of revolutions or restorations,—causes which can be regulated by no laws and which are recorded in no archives."[n]

Of education of this character the early Romans and Greeks were devoid; and in consequence they were not enabled to profit by the past in directing the course of their civilization. And as Schlegel[o] says:

"Without a knowledge of the mighty past, the philosophy of life, however much it may enchant by wit, or transport by eloquence, will never be able to carry us beyond the limits of the present, out of the narrow circle of our customs and immediate associations."

And if, in Herodotus and Plutarch an effort was made to analyze the secret cause of political prosperity or catastrophes, their lessons came too late to be available for practical use. And, in any event, would have been powerless to prevent the ruin that other causes, poverty principally—had already determined.

And this kind of knowledge, let it be borne in mind, will never flourish, or be of practical benefit as long as a people are bound by the religious traditions of the past.

[n] *Essays—Mitford's Greece.*

[o] *Lectures on Modern History.*

It is only with skepticism and infidelity that such studies are pursued, and it is only with the spread of skepticism and infidelity and heresy that their lessons will be heeded

For as long as a people believe that God's will is contained in a written "Revelation", and that this will is to be discovered and interpreted by ministers and preachers, just so long will they let all practical affairs, that do not too much incommode, pursue the course chance or circumstances may have determined; and, thinking that their duty consists, not in learning how to live and making earth lovable, but how to die and how to secure a place in heaven, they never question the justness of institutions that minister to their avarice or luxury.

And the ministers, fearful of weakening the basis of their authority, rather than tamper with the "Word", will allow a hundred inconsistencies and fallacies, that they cannot explain or justify, to pass as "holy mysteries" not to be questioned or reasoned about; will allow any amount of practical evil before they will risk weakening the faith of their flocks.

And finally, in analyzing the third factor—competence—we find that both in Rome and Greece (excepting, perhaps, Athens)[p] the wealth and dignity of the State were confined, in their early histories, to the land-owners. These land-owners, at first the cause of the rapid growth to political and intellectual greatness of the two nations, became ultimately the special cause of their decline and destruction. For be-

[p] "The more general diffusion of political rights and wealth in Athens was due to innovations inaugurated by Solon (540 B. C.) and completed by Kleistheres. The method by which this reform was accomplished by the latter was the doing away with the religious tribes as political units and substituting for them a larger number of new tribes, divided into cantons, taking in the whole body of Athenian citizens. Previously to the adoption of this political reform only the Eupatrides, the blue-blood

cause of the predominance thus given them, these land-owners became the oligarchs whose factious envy and ambition, first introduced disorder and revolution into Rome and Greece, and whose prejudice, egotism and self-interest, prevented the formation into a united nation of the various cities, tribes and colonies of Greece.[q]

Also by this private ownership of soil was produced the exclusion of many of the descendants of the land-owners themselves from access to land.[r]

And being "gentlemen" disdaining to work, and being supported by the contributions of the State,[s] their ambition,

land-owners, exercised any political rights. But though Athens had made this great advance in perfecting government, yet even at Athens political power was at no time granted to all the people, if this term is to be taken in the sense now generally attached to it. The greater body of resident foreigners, known as the Metoikoi, was excluded, while the slaves were of course never thought of."—*The Greeks and the Persians by G. W. Cox, M. A., pp.* 90–139.

[q] "And the best of the land was always the most subject to these changes of inhabitants. * * * For through the goodness of the land, both the power of some particular men, growing greater, caused factions among them, whereby they (the States) were ruined."—*Thucydides—Dale's Translation, p.* 2.

[r] "Thus in Sparta, in relation to one another, they were soldiers whose equality was expressed by their title of Homoioi or peers; but the penalty which inflicted disfranchisement on those who failed to pay their yearly contributions to the public messes, was constantly throwing off a number of landless and moneyless men, known as Hypomeiones or inferiors, and answering closely to the 'mean whites' of the late slave holding States of the American Union."—*Rev. G. W. Cox's, "The Greeks and the Persians," p.* 24.

[s] "The public rations at all times supported the poorest inhabitant of Rome, if he were a citizen."*—*Dinner, Real und Reputed, De Quincey.*

*"In Rome only, and at one time in some of the Grecian States, it was the very meaning of citizen that he should vote and be idle."—*Dinner, Real and Reputed, De Quincey.*

fostered by idleness, sought vent in revolt, in plots and conspiracies that contributed much to the disorder of the times, and the calamities of their countries.

But in addition to the disorders that were initiated and perpetrated by the ownership of soil in forming the oligarchical families, and the poor and idle citizens, this cause also produced another evil—the conversion of many free men into slaves, for, according to Mr. Cox, "it has been maintained by those who regard the representations of Plutarch as in the main trustworthy, that the system which tended to reduce English freemen to villenage was in the days of Solon converting the Attic peasants into slaves. Arrears of rent or of produce, payable to the owners of the soil, were changed into debts, for which the tenant was allowed by law to pledge his own body, or the bodies of his sisters, or his children."[t] And the extent of the injury thus inflicted in Greece may be inferred when we learn that in the time of Solon, the greater part of the Athenian soil was marked off by landmarks representing those ancient patriarchal rights which received their sanction from religion, and that the Eupatridai were lords of almost all the lands. And the extent of the injuries to Rome we learn by the following, taken from Gibbon :[u]

"The lands of Italy, which had been originally divided among the families of free and indigent proprietors, were insensibly purchased or usurped by the avarice of the nobles; and in the ages which preceded the fall of the Republic, it was computed that only two thousand citizens were possessed of an independent substance."

It will thus be seen, from this short and cursory survey of

[t] *Cox's General History of Greece.*

[u] Vol. III., p. 28.

the imperfect nature of the factors, liberty, education and competence, as they existed in the constitution of Greek and Roman societies, why the civilizations of Greece and Rome were so defective.

If now turning our eyes from the contemplation of the causes of the rise and decline of Rome and Greece, we consider for a moment a civilization of more modern date, and one too as conspicuous for as many excellencies as those of antiquity.[v] We will find additional food for reflection, and, perhaps, additional light to aid us in the organization of the society of the future.

We refer to the civilization developed by the Saracens in Spain, and more particularly to that which flourished in the Moorish kingdom of Granada, till as late as the middle of the fifteenth century.

The peculiar causes of that Moorish civilization, which

[v] "The first of the Ommiades who reigned in Spain, solicited the support of the Christians; and in his edict of peace and protection, he contents himself with a modest imposition of ten thousand ounces of gold, ten thousand pounds of silver, ten thousand horses, as many mules, one thousand cuirasses, with an equal number of helmets and lances. The most powerful of his successors derived from the same kingdom the annual tribute of twelve millions and forty-five thousand dinars or pieces of gold, about six millions of sterling money; a sum, which in the tenth century, most probably surpassed the united revenues of the Christian monarchs. His royal seat of Cordova contained six thousand mosques, nine hundred baths and two hundred thousand houses: he gave laws to eighty cities of the first, to three hundred of the second and third order; and the fertile banks of the Guadalquiver were adorned with twelve thousand* villages and hamlets. The Arabs might exaggerate the truth, but they created and they described the most prosperous era of the riches, the cultivation, and the populousness of Spain."—*Gibbon, Vol. V., p.* 262.

*See comment on this enumeration of the villages in note xix, Chap. VIII.—*Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella.*

made it to present such a gratifying and magnificent contrast to the condition of Christian Europe from the fifth to the thirteenth century, and which was at its brightest when that of Europe was at its darkest, was first, free land; and second, education.[w] We infer that the lands were not subject to private ownership from the fact that, in Oriental countries the contrary is the rule; and, also, from the expression "concentrated population," which Prescott uses in describing the Kingdom of Granada at the period we refer to.

For concentrated populations, according to our reading of history, is not compatible with the general happiness and prosperity that the peasantry of Granada enjoyed, and a civilization of any considerable development that has been erected upon a theory of political economy that recognizes private ownership of land as its basis.[x]

And our inference in this matter receives strong corroboration from the following extract also taken from Prescott's interesting work:

[w] "The age of Arabian learning continued about five hundred years, till the great eruption of the Moguls, and was coeval with the darkest and most slothful period of European annals."—*Gibbon, Vol. V., p.* 352.

[x] "The ample revenues of the Spanish Grandee of the present time, instead of being lavished on a band of military retainers, as of yore, are sometimes dispensed in the more peaceful hospitality of supporting an almost equally formidable host of needy relations and dependents. According to Bourgoanne (*Travels in Spain, Vol. I., Chap. IV.,*) no less than 3,000 of these gentry were maintained on the estates of the Duke of Arcos, who died in 1780."—*Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella, Introduction, note* 64.

And while a Christian, commenting on the above, might bless the hospitality that could stand such a strain, the philosopher may be allowed to curse the system of political economy which culminated in rendering so pernicious a hospitality necessary.

"The revenue which was computed at twelve hundred thousand ducats, was derived from similar, but, in some respects heavier, impositions than those of the Caliphs of Cordova. The crown, besides being possessed of valuable plantations in the Vega, imposed the onerous (?) tax of one-seventh on all the agricultural produce of the kingdom."—*Vol. I., p.* 291.

And as for the factor, education, Prescott says:

"The Mahometans of this period far excelled their enemies in general refinement, and had carried some branches of intellectual culture to a height scarcely surpassed by Europeans in latter days."—*Vol. I., p.* 42.[r]

Possessing these two important factors, we are prepared to give full credence to the historian's account of the condition of the Moorish Kingdom of Granada. This Kingdom

"Comprised within nearly the same limits as the modern province of the same name, was all that remained to the Moslems of their once vast possessions in the Peninsula. Its concentrated population gave it a degree of strength altogether disproportionate to the extent of its territory, and the profuse magnificence of its Court, which rivaled that of the ancient Caliphs, was supported by the labors of a sober, industrious people, under whom agriculture and several of the mechanic arts reached a degree of excellence, probably

[r] "For this period of brilliant illumination with the Saracens corresponds precisely with that of the deepest barbarism of Europe; when a library of three or four thousand volumes was a magnificent endowment for the richest monastery; when scarcely a priest, south of the Thames, in the words of Alfred, could translate Latin into his mother tongue; when not a single philosopher, according to Tirabosshi, was to be met with in Italy, save only the French Pope Sylvester, the II, who drew his knowledge from the schools of the Spanish Arabs, and was esteemed a necromancer for his pains."—*Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella, Vol. I., p.* 286.

unequaled in any other part of Europe during the Middle Ages."—*Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella, Vol. I., p.* 30.

And says Sir Rowland Blennerhassett, M. P., in the *Fortnightly Review* for August, 1881:

"In the first half of the Middle Ages the peasantry of Naples and Sicily were by no means badly off, and strange as it may seem they owed their prosperity to the Mahometan conquest, which had very similar results there to what it had in Spain. During the three centuries that Sicily was ruled by the followers of the Prophet, it enjoyed a degree of prosperity which it has never since attained. The population of the Island in the eleventh century was 2,773,404.[z]

* * With the Norman invasion things began to change, and a feudal system was imposed upon southern Italy, which for many centuries pressed heavily on the population."

And what was the gain of the people by the expulsion of the Saracens and the introduction of "Christian" methods in Spain? Sir Rowland tells us, when he says:

"I will merely say that, owing to some particular institutions not in the least connected with feudalism, the peasant was so oppressed that, in the last century, the Benedictine Monk, Feyoo, so good and sober an authority, does not hesitate to say that the lot of the Spanish agriculturist was worse than that of a criminal undergoing hard labor."

Unfortunately, because of not possessing the third factor, good government, this civilization in turn disappeared before the united effects of continual assaults from the Spaniards, and of that process of natural decay which will always be a

[z] "With the result that the capital of the country, Granada, in the words of the historian, had become the common city of all nations. The reputation of the citizens for trustworthiness, says a Spanish writer, was such that their bare word was more relied on, than a written contract is now among us, and he quotes the saying of a Catholic bishop, that Moorish works and Spanish faith were all that was necessary to make a good Christian."—*Idem, p.* 291

consequence, sooner or later, of evils that will arise to consume a nation when either one of the factors we have so often mentioned, Ignorance, Bad Government, and Poverty, remains a permanency in its civilization.

Not possessing this essential factor, Good Government, and climatic influences concurring to assist their foes, the only surprise we feel in view of the ultimate overthrow of its national existence, is, that "on this comparatively small point of their ancient kingdom, the Saracens" (had) "erected a new kingdom of sufficient strength to resist, for more than two centuries, the united forces of the Spanish Monarchies."[aa]

The Spaniards, on the other hand possessing the rudiments of a correct theory of government, civil liberty (which they obtained as a heritage from the Roman Empire), and personal liberty and a sense of personal independence, which they owed to their "barren mountains" and to their Visigothic predecessors,[bb] eventually because of their numbers,

[aa] "For it was easy to foresee that a people, living as they did, under circumstances so well adapted to the development of both physicial and moral energy, must ultimately prevail over a nation oppressed by *despotism*, and the effeminate indulgence to which it was naturally disposed by a sensual *religion* and a voluptuous *climate*. (Italics ours).—*Idem Vol. I. p.* 38.

[bb] "For the Visigoths, who overran the Peninsula in the fifth century, brought with them the same liberal principles which distinguished their Teutonic brethren. Their crown was declared elective by a formal legislative act. Laws were enacted in the great national councils, composed of prelates and nobility, and not infrequently ratified by an assembly of the people. Their code of jurisprudence, although abounding in frivolous details, contained many admirable provisions for the security of justice; and in the degree of civil liberty which it accorded to the Roman inhabitants of the country, far transcended those of the other barbarians of the North. In, short their simple policy exhibited the germs of some of those institutions which other nations, and under happier auspices, have formed the basis of a well regulated constitutional liberty."*—*Idem, p.* 32.

*See *The Factors of Civilization, Vol. I., Chap. VII.*

their courage, and their poverty, were able to dispossess the Saracens of the kingdom they had occupied with such good results for so long a time.

But that these factors alone were powerless to produce ultimate good to the civilization the Spaniards developed so rapidly, we have already seen. And the following extract from Prescott will show what was the the system of holding lands in Spain after the expulsion of the Moors, and will account for the ultimate decay of Spanish freedom and prosperity:

"The demesnes of John, Lord of Biscay, confiscated by Alfonso the Eleventh to the use of the crown in 1327, amounted to more than eighty towns and castles. The good Constable Davalos, in the time of Henry the Third, could ride through his own estates all the way from Seville to Compostella, almost the two extremities of the kingdom. Alvaro de Luna, the powerful favorite of John the Second, could muster twenty thousand vassals. A contemporary, who gives a catalogue of the annual rents of the Castilian nobility at the close of the fifteenth or beginning of the following century, computes several at fifty and sixty thousand ducats a year, (from $438,875 to $526,650) "an immense income, if we take into consideration the value of money in that age." The same writer estimates their united revenues as equal to one-third of those in the whole kingdom."[cc]

If now, reversing the conditions, we desire to learn the results that will follow the introduction of a system of political economy, based upon private ownership of land, into

[cc] *Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella, Vol. I., p.* 61.

"A great part of the territory in Spain was engrossed by the nobility. L. Marinæus Seculus, who composed his treatise, *De Rebus Hispaniæ*, during the reign of Charles V., gives a catalogue of the Spanish nobility, together with the yearly rent of their estates. According to his account, which he affirms was as accurate as the nature of the subject would admit, the sum total of the annual revenue of their lands amounted to one mil-

the civilization of those nations where land is free, we have only to recall what has been said on this subject in chapter fourteen of this volume.

And that these evil results were not because they happened "long ago," nor because of a want of education, or a defective theory of government, it is only necessary to remind the reader of the terrible calamities that have overtaken every nation that England has imposed her civilization upon, dating back, for centuries, to massacres and confiscations in Ireland, to the bombardment and conflagration of Alexandria to-day.

Remembering the description given of the condition of the people of India, by Burke, recalling Macaulay's remarks on the same subject in his essay on Warren Hastings, and bearing in mind what the condition of the masses in India is at present, we may rightly conclude that where land is subject to private ownership, where, in a word, the basis of political economy is erroneous, that no amount of education or liberty will prevent terrible consequences to the people.[dd]

lion four hundred and eighty-two thousand ducats. If we make allowance for the great difference in the value of money in the fifteenth century from that which it now bears, and consider that the catalogue of Marinæus included only the *Titulados*, or nobility, whose families were distinguished by some honorary title, their wealth must appear very great."—*Note xxxiii., Sec. iii., p. 215—Robertson's History of the Middle Ages.*

[dd] If a country possesses this fundamental factor, free lands and competence, and prosperity and happiness do not result, it will be because in that country the people have not sufficient knowledge to cultivate the lands, or because of bad government; and government may produce unfortunate results as much by officious interference with commerce, or by "fixing" prices, as it can by oppression and extortion, or by neglecting those enterprises that may be necessary to enable individual efforts to reap the reward of industry, but which from their magnitude, or because

We insert an interesting editorial from the columns of the *Missouri Republican*, of July 23d, 1882, which will corroborate all that we have said in this connection as far as relates to India, and which will be more clearly appreciated by the light of the deductions arrived at herein:

"Sir John Strachey and Lieut.-General Richard Strachey,

of the poverty of the people, are too expensive for individuals to effect. The following example must suffice; for further details and illustrations the reader is referred to Vol. I, Chap. VIII of this work. Says Charles Mac Farlane, Esq., in his *Turkey and Its Destiny:*

"This system" of establishing by government a maximum of prices, "had already caused a great abandonment of gardening and agriculture; this had happened and was happening in the plain and near to a great city, which is not what it was, but which must still be called a *populous* city. * * * In our rides we had seen fields recently cultivated totally abandoned, and we had heard several men say that they would grow only just enough to feed themselves and families. And why should Greek or Turk sweat and toil where he is not allowed a free market for his produce?"—Vol. I., p. 99. And to illustrate how oppression and injustice will produce the same result of poverty to the people, we quote from the same work, p. 101: "The vineyards and mulberry plantations were most carefully tended (near Sousourluk), and by far the best we had seen. Though the implements used were rude and primitive, there was no sign of rudeness in the result produced. The wheat, the maize, the barley, had been gathered in, and the harvest as usual had been most abundant—proportionate to the care and industry of the people. We saw an unusual quantity of cattle, and the oxen and buffaloes seemed all in excellent condition. Yet the house of a farmer at which we stopped, and all the houses in the village, seemed in sad plight—half in ruins—and the Greeks were wringing their hands and tearing their hair, and swearing that they would plow and sow no more; that they would give up houses and lands and emigrate; that, through the maximum on the one hand and the greed and injustice of the tax-gatherer on the other, they were all being reduced to beggary. The taxes were farmed out. The regime of the old *Fermiers Generaux* of France—one of the greatest causes of the revolution of 1789—now obtained in *reformed* Turkey."

two brothers, somewhat noted in Indian affairs, have recently published a book, perhaps more important than interesting, entitled: "The Finances and Public Works of India from 1869 to 1881." A competent and impartial critic says of it:

'Nobody can read this book and doubt the perfect sincerity of its authors. Their panacea for the ills of India is a very simple one, and they are entirely convinced of its efficiency; it is to borrow enormous sums of money and construct therewith canals and railways all over India. They claim to have restored India to a state of affluence because they have carried out this policy to a large extent, though not to that enormous extent which a far-reaching wisdom would have enjoined. At the same time, from the midst of a huge and bewildering chaos of figures, these broad facts are clearly to be recognized: During eleven years of peace the ordinary debt of India has been increased by £60,000,000, from £97,000,000 to £157,000,000; £142,000,000 have been expended on canals and irrigation works which are called 'productive,' but which as yet have not returned enough to pay the costs of their annual maintenance; £15,000,000 have had to be expended in famine relief, notwithstanding which 8,000,000 of the people of India have succumbed to hunger; £18,000,000 have been spent on the futile war in Afghanistan; and the excess of exports from India over imports, during the same time, has exceeded the gigantic sum of £120,000,000.

It is freely admitted upon all sides that there is no capital available in India for the construction of these huge and costly railway lines. The people live from hand to mouth, and possess nothing which is not required for the needs of the day. Capital must, therefore, be imported, and the interest on all such capital has to be paid by the very people, who, in order to pay it, must deduct the amount from their already scanty subsistence. Thus the primary effect of the State undertaking to construct canals and railways in India is to intensify the prevailing impoverishment of the people.'

Yet the Strachey brothers have no patience with those persons, in and out of England, who, having these and similar facts staring them in the face, declare that 'the people of India are becoming poorer and poorer, more and more exposed to ruin and death by famine; that crushing taxa-

tion goes on constantly increasing; that an enormous and ruinous tribute is exacted from India to be spent in England.' The Stracheys, who unquestionably represent the dominant sentiment among their countrymen, insist that English rule in India is the greatest possible blessing to the natives, and that if the latter do not 'see it' they are blinded by ignorance and prejudice that must sooner or later disappear, and in any event, it is the imperative duty of England to continue the blessing. Dr. Russell, the once famous war correspondent of the London *Times*, relates an incident of his visit to India in 1857, which has a sharp and significant bearing upon our subject. Meeting at Simla a highly educated native gentleman in the employ of the government, he ventured to ask him how the people generally regarded their foreign masters. The gentleman hesitated, and expressed his reluctance to answer the question. Being urged to speak freely he finally did so, to this effect: 'Our people do not and cannot understand you. Your manners, customs, tastes, views and actions are so entirely different from theirs that many believe you belong to another order of beings. The prevailing opinion among them is that you are powerful and terrible creatures from an unknown land, whom God, in His inscrutable wisdom, has allowed to torment us for a time—perhaps as a punishment for our sins.' Dr. Russell had no doubt of the sincerity and truthfulness of his informant, and confessed that the revelation shocked more than it surprised him."

To return now for a moment to the reconsideration of the cause of the perpetuation of slavery in the South longer than in the North. In addition to the causes already given, another yet remains to be presented. The same freedom from abject poverty that characterized the ancient civilizations, because of the existence of slavery, also characterized Southern society as compared with the Free States of the North. And it is certain that Southern statesmen, and Southern gentlemen who had occasion to examine the con-

dition of the poorest classes North, had nothing to reproach themselves with in comparing the results to the poor of their own peculiar institutions.[ee]

Like the Persian Embassador of De Quincey, in London or Paris, they might boast that in their native States no such spectacles existed of hunger-bitten myriads as might be seen everywhere North during seasons of distress.

And the civilization of both North and South being ostensibly based upon a Bible that had declared that "the poor should not cease out of the land,"[ff] it might readily be considered an open question with the Southerner, if, poverty being *thus admitted as a necessity, and a fixity*, a wise provision of Providence, freedom from the bitterest pangs of poverty by being able to possess clothing, food and shelter (which was alwas insured the slave),[gg] was not preferable to a condition which, while conferring an empty right, also left the

[ee] "When the slave-holders of the South looked upon the condition of the free laboring poor in the most advanced civilized countries, it is no wonder that they easily persuaded themselves of the Divine institution of slavery. That the field hands of the South were, as a class, better fed, better lodged, better clothed; that they had less care, more of the amusements and enjoyments of life, than the agricultural laborers of England, there can be no doubt, and even in the Northern cities visiting slave-holders might see and hear of things impossible under what they called their 'division of labor.'"—*Poverty and Progress, p.* 318.

[ff] "Now among the political theories of the Bible is this, that pauperism is not an accident in the constitution of States, but an indefeasible necessity; or, in the Scriptural words, that 'the poor shall not cease out of the land.'"—*De Quincey's Greece Under the Romans.*

[gg] In North Carolina the legal standard of food for a slave was not less than a quart of corn per day. In Louisiana the legal standard was one barrel of Indian corn, or the equivalent of this in rice, beans or other grain, and a pint of salt every month. The quantity allowed by custom, according to T. S. Clay, of Georgia, was a peck of corn per week.

recipient to feel all the woes of modern civilization, starvation, stinted clothing,and alm-houses.

And also comparing the condition of the class above the slaves in the social circle who, because of the nature of their poverty, were exempt from the hardening and grinding operations of competition with all its belittling and unhappy results,[hh] with the condition of those above the rank of the Northern poor, they might find additional reasons to congratulate themselves and their country that the two civilizations were not similar in development.

We are thus particular in contrasting the civilizations of the North and the South to show—1st, how careful we should be in applying our rule of government to any nation in the endeavor to ascertain by its application the degree of morality or happiness of a nation.

Not only must we take into consideration the degree of development that has been attained by the laws, as applied to the security or privileges of the citizens of a country, but we must note to what extent the Germanic ideal of personal independence is recognized by these laws, and also whether this union of civil law and personal rights is confined to classes as classes, or is extended to all the adult inhabitants of the nation. As already said, it is only when this last condition has been attained that the ideal government may be said to exist, perfect in this particular.

And when this government does exist, if happiness and virtue are not the result, we may confidently predict that the

[hh] "There is something singularly captivating in the unbounded hospitality, the impulsive generosity, the carelessness for the future, the frank, open manners, the buoyant spirit and courage, which mark the (Southern) people."—*Extract from letter of Dr. William Ellery Channing to H. Clay, on the Annexation of Texas.*

cause lies either in ignorance or poverty; religion, being a consequence, cuts but little if any figure in the case. And when this is the case, any attempt to force the people to be virtuous and happy by statute enactments is useless and mischievous, is in fact as if we would try to cure the small-pox by experimenting as to what remedy should be applied to the manifestations of the disease.

And though, as we have said, while the government of the North came nearer to the ideal standard than that of the South, it is not to be supposed that therefore the poor of the North, that is, the great majority, were happier than the poor of the South, that is, the poor whites and the slaves. For poverty being more extreme, and the consequences of poverty being more dreadful in the North than in the South, this excess of misery from this cause did much to annul the benefits that theoretically should follow upon the more perfect conception of liberty. While in the South the complete freedom from the extremes of poverty did much to atone for the theoretically deficient government.

We have already seen (see note *d* Chapter X of this volume) that, even at the present time, twenty years after the war, owing to comparative freedom from the anxieties attendant upon poverty, and to the absence of that demoralizing spirit of speculation, now, alas! becoming all too common with the Southern people, the consumption of liquor in the South, population considered, is far less than in the richer Eastern States; and this same freedom from poverty, which characterized Southern society, will justify the conclusions noted by Dr. Sanger, and will explain the reason why, in the matter of prostitution, as well as in drunkenness, the South could present so gratifying a record:

"The number of prostitutes in New York, who were born

within the limits of the United States, slightly exceeds three-eighths of the aggregate from whom replies to these queries were obtained. There are natives of twenty-one States and one district, and may be subdivided in geographical order as follows:

"1. The Eastern District, containing Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island, contributes one hundred and seventy-two women to the prostitutes of New York City.

"2. The Middle States: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, District of Columbia, Delaware, Maryland and Virginia, contribute five hundred and sixty-six women.[11]

"3. The Southern States: North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Louisiana contributed twelve women.

"4. The Western States: Ohio, Illinois, Missouri and Kentucky, contributed also twelve women.

"On what hypothesis can these proportions be explained? Maine, on the extreme northeast, with a rocky, surge-beaten coast, fronting on the wild Atlantic, with a harsh, cold climate, sends twenty-four women from her population of 580,000, while Virginia, with 1,421,000 inhabitants, contributes but nine. This difference in favor of the Southern States can not be explained on the ground of distance, for the boundaries of each State are nearly equi-distant from New York; nor can it be sustained by the idea that Maine has more sea-coast, as the maritime coast of the Southern State is at least equal to that of the Northern one, and the ordinary tendencies to immorality in sea-port towns would be equally felt in each. The

[11] Of this total from the Middle States:

New York contributed	394
New Jersey contributed	69
Pennsylvania contributed	77
District of Columbia contributed	1
Delaware contributed	1
Maryland contributed	15
Virginia contributed	9
Total	566

case is still further involved by the fact that in all Southern cities the majority of prostitutes are from the North, and it is a well known circumstance, that at certain periods large numbers of courtesans from New York, Boston and other cities, emigrate southward. Were the generally received opinion of the effects of a warm climate upon female organization to be adopted in this connection, not only would there be no necessity for this exodus, but the number of prostitutes received from Virginia should largely exceed those from Maine. * * * The former lead a life of comparative hardship, the latter one of comparative ease.

"In Maine, over six thousand women, or one in every forty-six of the female population, are immured for six days in every week in a crowded factory; in Virginia, only three thousand women, or one in every one hundred and thirty-four of the female population are similarly employed. * *

"Again, place in contrast Rhode Island, with eighteen women living by prostitution in New York, and a population of only 140,000, and Maryland, with fifteen prostitutes in New York, and a population of 418,000, and a more palpable difference in favor of the Southern States is apparent. The former sends one prostitute for every eight thousand of her inhabitants; the latter, one out of every twenty-eight thousand.

"Calculating on the basis of the respective populations, Vermont and New Hampshire have nearly the same proportion as Maine; Massachusetts exceeds the average, and Connecticut (*par excellence* the land of steady habits) has a still larger excess. New Jersey has the largest proportion of any State in the Union, and Pennsylvania shows about the average of Maine. The Southern and Western States have but few representatives.

"New York, the home State, will be noticed in due course. The preceding facts will supply material for reflection, in connection with the question, 'On what hypothesis can these proportions be explained?'"[3]

[3] *Sanger's History of Prostitution, pp.* 456, 457. (*New York City, August 10th,* 1858.)

And that the superiority in this respect that characterized the agricultural Southern States, when compared with the commercial and manufacturing Northern States, was not due to superior orthodoxy, is demonstrated by the fact that in England, at a contemporary date, when the religion professed was essentially the same, but where manufactures and commerce were at their greatest development, the same contrast in favor of the agricultural sections was noticeable. And in addition it will be seen by the following tables that religious professions are powerless to prevent prostitution when distress or despair force in the direction of prostitution the poor women who are obliged, by cheap labor, to seek, by this method, a livelihood.

"Question. Were you trained to any religion? If so, was it Protestant or Catholic?

Religion.	Numbers.
Protestant	972
Roman Catholic	977
No religious training	51
Total	2,000

Question. Do you profess the same religion now?

Profession.	Numbers.
Profess religion as educated	1,909
Non-professors	91
Total	2,000"

"Explanations" and evasions in view of the above replies would be multiplied indefinitely, should we press the argument home that the statements of the two thousand prostitutes interrogated should be taken as final evidence that religion is not a factor to be relied on to prevent prostitution, when circumstances force in this direction the

minds of women; we will content ourselves with reiterating our proposition, and submit the tables for so much as they are worth to the unprejudiced reader. In examining another table, however, also compiled under the auspices and direction of the "Board of Governors of the Alms-House of the City of New York and County of New York" (a body called into existence by an Act of the State Legislature, April 6, 1849), we have revealed to us why these women resorted to prostitution for a living, or to support mothers, sisters, fathers, or friends.

Question. What were your average weekly earnings at your trade?

Average Earnings.	Number.
One Dollar	534
Two Dollars	336
Three Dollars	230
Four Dollars	127
Five Dollars	68
Six Dollars	27
Seven Dollars	8
Eight Dollars	5
Twenty Dollars	1
Fifty Dollars	1
Unascertained	663
Total	2,000

In short, nearly 27 per cent. of the whole number interrogated were paid only one dollar a week, while 55 per cent. of the whole number were paid an average price of two dollars per week.

As long as wages of this amount are all a woman has offered in return for work—for six days' work—so long will women furnish from their ranks "sinners" for Christians to pray for and to sneer at. And to this point wages invari-

ably gravitate under our present beautiful system of political economy. Therefore we must again urge caution in deducing conclusions from observation of the co-existence of our geometrical test with happiness and virtue.

Not only are we to satisfy ourselves that the government is of a kind that will insure protection to life and property while affording full room for individual pursuits, tastes and development, and observe if this law and freedom is extended, not to a class as the privilege of their order, but to the whole body of citizens as a right; but we must, in addition, note how far the beneficial effects of this ideal government is assisted or retarded in promoting happiness and virtue by the presence or absence of ignorance or poverty.

And while we cannot go as minutely into details of investigating this interesting subject as we could wish, the following general rules will show what our ideas are on this subject, and may possibly assist the general reader in drawing his own conclusion of the moral condition of a nation if he has the form of their government, the amount of education, and their poverty or wealth to argue from.

The morality and happiness of the subject classes will be low in proportion as ignorance prevails among the upper classes. And, therefore, it follows that the condition of slaves is generally saddest and most degrading in countries where education is of a low order, or is not generally diffused. For the ruling class, possessing already, in a more or less perfect manner, in a greater or less development, wealth and good government (amongst themselves) only require that the third quantity, knowledge, should co-exist to make them tender and gentle, humane and just. Which justice, humanity, etc., however, cannot reach a very high development when confined to classes in this condition of government; simply be-

cause the desire for display or ambition is always fed by servility, or aspires to assert itself through arrogance; thus preventing perfect development in consequence of the existence of those ready to praise or admire extravagance, or to assist ambition; and this very existence of class distinctions, has a tendency to engender haughtiness, pride and arrogance on one side, and humility and servility on the other.[kk] But these effects aside, and speaking generally, the rule will hold good that the condition of the subject races will improve with the increasing knowledge of their masters. Hence the word *slavery* may represent in different ages and countries very different facts.[ll] The treatment of the negroes by the Southern slave-holders was as a father treats his children, if compared with the treatment of the Indians by the Christian Spaniards, the negro slaves by the planters

[kk]The only phase of the character of the Southerner of *ante-bellum* days, whose contemplation, by their descendants, is calculated to fill them with sentiments of sorrow and regret, is the spirit of domineering braggadocio and bullyism that, unfortunately in too many instances, characterized, in the old times, the utterances of some of our Southern Congressmen in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

[ll]From other causes than education the yoke of slavery is very light among the Tartars.

"The Tartars who do not belong to the Royal Family, are all slaves, living in absolute subjection to their masters. Besides the rent, they are bound to keep their master's flocks and herds, but they are not forbidden to breed also cattle on their own account. It would be a fallacy to imagine that slavery in Tartary is oppressive and cruel, as amongst some nations; the noble families scarcely differ from the slave families. In examining the relations between them, it would be difficult to distinguish the master from the slave; they live both alike in tents, and both alike occupy their lives in pasturing their flocks. You will never find among them luxury and opulence insolently staring in the face of poverty." etc.—*Huc's Travels in Tartary, Thibet and China—p.* 163.

in Jamaica, or elsewhere, a hundred years ago; or the treatment at present in many cases of prisoners by their jailers, and of convicts by some lessees of penitentiaries. The religious dogmas of the nation remain the same, or grow less in intensity and precision, but knowledge increases and is diffused, and hence the greater humanity. And again,

Rule 2: The condition of the subject classes will be happy in proportion as their physical wants are abundantly supplied, and their natural affections are allowed scope; while their misery will be intensified and their unhappiness rendered greater in proportion as their intellectual wants and powers are developed.

Hence, the happiness of a slave will be as the inverse proportion his knowledge and physical comfort bear to each other. And so with the peasantry and poor of nations. Their happiness will be great, government being strong if not perfect, in proportion to the inverse ratio their knowledge bears to their physical condition. If their ignorance is great, and their poverty is great also, of course both the slaves and the populace will be unhappy. So would brutes. But if the fact of their condition *is a fixity*, the philosopher will endeavor to add to their physical comforts rather than to their knowledge in the effort to make them happier. And the conspirator or socialist can find no surer way to make them become rebels or communists, and atheists, and to intensify their wretchedness, than to enlighten their ignorance and let their physical condition go unimproved.

And as intentions count for nothing at the court of the law of cause and effect, we can understand how our government, with the best intentions, is every day, by its common school system ripening the people for revolt against the existing system of political economy upon which our society is founded.

By the light of this deduction, then, that the happiness and contentment of the masses will be secured according as their knowledge shall be small and their physical wants amply provided for, we can understand why Rome should have averted destruction by dissolution from within as long as she did. And can appreciate the wisdom of those tyrants who, by heaping largess and food upon the populace, not only committed with impunity their horrible crimes against the State and against nature itself, but became actually endeared to the mass of the people. "With the mob of Rome," says De Quincey, "there is reason to think that Commodus continued to be a favorite to the last."

And by this deduction, too, we may also measure the time when our American civilization shall have become so prostituted by the immense wealth which is so rapidly accumulalating in the hands of a few monopolists, which is now being applied to the purchasing of voters, to the bribing of Judges, and to a policy-dictated alms-giving,[mm] (making the mobs of our cities but to be as clay in the hands of the molder, to do the will and execute the decrees of these monopolists.)

But while this process of demoralizing our poor, and controlling or evading our laws, shall be perfecting itself, and destruction from above shall be threatening the nation, there is some comfort in reflecting that there is another force developing in the bosom of society which will eventually collide with this power; and monopolists, like the court ministers of Byzantium, will find that *just as their system is*

[mm] "How would Democritus have been affected to see * * * * one rob Peter to pay Paul; scrape unjust sums with one hand, purchase great manors by corruption, fraud and cozenage, and liberally to distribute to the poor, with the other give a remnant to pious use?" etc.—*Anatomy of Melancholy, p.* 44.

about to attain perfection their power and their methods, like the etiquette and formula of Constantinople, will be swept from existence together.

Education is progressing. Every day we are making progress towards reversing that order in which ignorance and poverty must stand to each other to enable despotic power or monopolies to be successful, or oligarchical power and contention to continue unchecked by the citizens. In place of knowledge being small and physical comforts great, knowledge is becoming universal and poverty is increasing. Woe the day to monopolists, and perhaps to all, when the positions shall be reversed, and the people will have much knowledge and little bread!

In determining the healthy condition of nations, then, we must bear in mind that these three things must co-exist: knowledge, good government and competence. And these must bear a greater or less correspondence to each other in development, or, if any one be in excess, that one must be competence.[nn] And the systems upon which each is based must all be equally characterized by the following point of similarity—equality of results. In other words, all must be based on systems whose tendency shall be to raise all above slavery, above natural ignorance, above poverty.

[nn]The next in importance and to be presented, is education, and last, liberty. It was because this order was not observed that the French Revolution, good in itself, produced so much misery and vice. And those of our readers who have followed the arguments in this work can form their own estimate of the wisdom displayed by the earlier Abolitionists of the North in their efforts to bring about the freedom of a grossly ignorant people, when they recall some of the utterances of this party. Thus Mr. Loyd Garrison, in the call for the sixteenth annual meeting, of the American Anti-Slavery Society, used these words: "A contest of twenty years has proved that the only hopeful issue with slavery is the demand for the *immediate and unconditional emancipation of every slave.*"

We want no law or no government to determine for us how we are to get education, nor how much education we may have; neither do we want a law or a government that shall tell us how we may become Justices of the Peace, or Senators in the United States Congress; neither do we want a law or country to tell us how high we may rise on the political ladder. And we want no law or government to tell us how we may get rich, nor how much wealth we may acquire; neither do we want the government to help us into a way of getting wealth.

But that we have in politics, the right to become Senators if we can, and in knowledge, the right to become wise if we will; these we must have in equal measure in the matter of overcoming poverty. In neither of the first cases are obstructions placed in our way by the monopolization of all the offices by a few—by the confiscation of all the books and school-houses by a clique, nor should we be debarred from attaining competency by the monopolization of land by some. For as this is not the system to be adopted with reference to knowledge and political rights, neither is it right to put the lands, the ultimate source of all wealth, in the possession of a few.

Give every man his rights under the Constitution, and if he does not become a member of Congress or at least a Justice of the Peace, he does not deserve to become one; certainly he is not entitled to any sympathy from us if he does not. Give every man access to books and schools, and if he does not obtain an education it is his fault; and when it will become fashionable to give every illiterate man a dime, he need expect no penny of ours. So, give every man access to the land without taxing him in rents and indirect taxes for three-fourths of what he produces, and he too will soon

extricate himself from the clutches of want. And when this is done, when the land shall be as free as the air or the water, which it should be, then this man, too, may expect no charity from his neighbors. He will need no charity.

He who has worked so long for others, for so little, will certainly work as hard for himself, for so much.[oo]

When this is accomplished, then will our Republic stand upon a rock and "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Like a man with a sound head, stomach and heart, our development will be onward to greater health, but if one of these organs is diseased, sooner or later it will be with us as though all the other organs were diseased also. The young apple on the tree will grow if the tree is healthy. So will our civilization grow if the tree of our Constitution is sound, and it will produce religion, its natural result. But let that apple have but one speck, and soon it will be rotten to the core.

In the course of ages, by adopting a right basis, man has been able to establish principles of government which have resulted in making our present Constitution such a contrast

[oo] "It is the fashion with residents in the country to speak of the Bulgarian as lazy and idle, but from my own experience I do not think it is a fair accusation. It is true that the amount of work done by him in the year is very small, but that is the fault of his religion, which forbids him to work during the feast and fast days, which, including Sundays, number one hundred and eighty-one out of the three hundred and sixty-five days in the year. When he does work, he rises at 4 A. M. in the winter and feeds his working cattle, and is away before daybreak to his bit of land, which is perhaps two miles or more distant, and he plows until he can no longer see to do so."—*Turkey, p.* 87. *James Baker, M. A., New York*, 1877.

Also see note g. pp. 311–312, this volume.

to that of the freest of ancient nations. In the course of ages, by adopting a right basis, man has been able to make such progress in knowledge, has obtained such control over nature, has made so many discoveries, that the wisest of the past, could they but awake to the wonders of modern civilization, would fancy themselves but changed from a stupid to a dreamful rest.

But through all the civilizations, from that of Greece upward, on the subject of advance in general competence there has been but little, if any, improvement

If there has been an advantageous change in America, new land and much of it, and few people, are the reasons. But in old countries there has been in this respect no advance at all. Still the great majority are poor, still wealth accumulates in the hands of a few, and still wickednes and vice, misery and unhappiness, is necessarily the lot of all.

And all advance will prove of no avail if we do not quickly master this last problem. One fatal disease is as sure to kill as three. We will be as sure to die as a nation because of an erroneous system of political economy, as though we had all the other evils wasting our life.

All progress in the past, or at least the first steps, we made in advancing from a wrong to a correct principle of government, was marked in blood. All knowledge emerged from ignorance only as it ran the gauntlet of flame and persecution.

Groans, tears, prisons, rapine, arson, butchery, torture and death, were the penalties man paid for obstructing the onward march of liberty and knowledge. Is it possible that freedom from poverty is to be obtained only in the same way? Is it possible that with all our knowledge we know not this—that we must go onward?

And if the arguments and facts given in this book are true, to enable us to go onward we must obtain a system of political economy which will secure to every man the ability to place himself in the possession of a competency. And to obtain this we have seen it is absolutely necessary that every man should have a right to cultivate the land, paying no rent for the privilege except such as, in shape of taxes, his government may need.

Now we may clearly understand why European nations have developed but to decay and expire. Like a locomotive placed upon a bad road, has European civilization been. And all advance that has been made has been the improving of the two engines of the locomotive (that is, in accumulating education and liberty,) and paying no attention to the laying of the rail on this road-bed, we have rushed to destruction just because of the perfection of our locomotive.

On the other hand, Oriental nations, having a good road-bed (free land), have been enabled, with an inferior locomotive, to joggle and jostle along almost indefinitely. They no not make such a show, or produce such grand results as do European nations while these last; but, having a good track, they run around it with their imperfect engines forever.

Is it not possible to put our Europeo-American locomotives on this road-bed and track of the East?[pp] If we can, then we will have established a correct basis and correct methods for promoting a healthy civilization. If we cannot,

[pp] Having provided for our eternal welfare in the world to come, by adopting a religion indigenous to Asia, there can be no impropriety in our taking from the same source a principle of land tenure which, as we have seen, is so necessary to our well-being here on earth.

a little time, a few years more, and by the very perfection of our engines, our locomotive will also fly the track, and in the disasters—perhaps the carnage—that will ensue, we will reap the consequences of our blindness, prejudice and obstinacy.

END OF VOL. II.

THE

FACTORS OF CIVILIZATION:

IN THREE VOLUMES.

(Each Volume Complete in Itself.)

VOLUME I.

I. On the Unhappiness Due to Erroneous Theological Conceptions and Doctrines.

II. On the Unhappiness Arising from Bad Forms of Government.

III. On the Unhappiness Arising from Ignorance.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

INTRODUCTION.

Statement of the case—Gregory of Nyssa, and Mr. Peek—Religion an effect, not a cause—Mr. Mallock and the Bible.

CHAPTER I.

On the unhappiness arising from theological dogmas, and pressure of spiritual problems, erroneously interpreted.

CHAPTER II.

The foundations examined of an assumed factor—The three curses—The Scriptural account of the cause of death—Examinations of the second cause—The cursing of the ground—The facts as they exist compared with the Bible statement of what should occur because of the "fall"—Ireland, England, Scotland, India, the United States, Mexico, Egypt—Comparisons instituted—Contradictions of dogma by facts—Examination of the third curse—Pain in child-bearing—Parturition of savage and civilized woman—Heathens and Christians contrasted—Contradiction by facts to statement made in Genesis—Chloroform and the Fruit-diet.

CHAPTER III.

Necessity for double demonstration of the error of theological conceptions—The increase of education necessitates new methods of religious teachings—To prevent the recoil from Orthodoxy landing us in Atheism—Examination of the first curse—The cause of death—Examination of various evasions adopted to reconcile facts with dogmas—Facts compared with the denunciation—Christian Europe and Sceptical Europe—Death rates compared, children and sinners, death rate compared—Preachers and actors—Missionaries die earlier than other ministers—Jesus and Hobbes—The rational conception of death—The relation of the soul to the body—Folly of attempting to improve upon methods employed by God—The want of facts to substantiate unreasonable suppositions, no warrant for invention—Examination of anticipated objections—Enthusiasm an attribute of imperfection—Impossibility of determining if inspiration is from God or otherwise, except by the test of reason or experience—St. Francis Assisi and Guiteau—Reason based upon correct premises the only hope—Reason is revelation.

CHAPTER IV.

Parallel conceptions pursued by the mind of man in solving the problem of the death of individuals and of multitudes—The folly of considering that death is a penalty because of original sin—The idea of government and the faculty of reverence compared in their development—Review of Catholic opinions and conduct—Necessity of freeing the religious faculty from the conceptions and creeds of the past—Byzantine Empire and Medieval Europe—Necessity for Infidelity, Revolutions and Innovations.

CHAPTER V.

Examination of the nature of man—Examples from various nations—The negroes of New Guinea—Du Chaillu in Ashango Land—Livingstone and Plutarch on some African tribes—Japan and China as reported by various travelers—The Tartars and Thibetans as described by M. Huc and Cochrane--Numerous other examples—The nature of man is good—That at least is the tendency—Regeneration, necessary only if nature of man is proved to be evil—Justification and sanctification only to be accomplished by educational, governmental and physical means.

CHAPTER VI.

Conclusions arrived at after examining the foundations of Theology—Dispelling of the unhappiness that has existed because of the belief that

death is a penalty of Adam's sin—That man was born to mourn—That man is necessarily corrupt—All vice and misery and sin due to ignorance, bad government, or poverty.

CHAPTER VII.

The essential factors separated and examined—On the Influence of Government in producing unhappiness—Some Christian and some Heathen governments contrasted—Unless government is good, all other factors, including Christianity, unable to prevent unhappiness, vice and misery—Retarding influence Christianity has exercised on the development of government—Illustrations from France, England, Russia, Rome, Naples, Abyssinia, etc.—What constitutes a "Good Government"—The test.

CHAPTER VIII.

On the Influence of Ignorance in producing unhappiness—Without knowledge all other factors impotent to prevent vice, misery and unhappiness—Examples furnished by Spain, Scotland, Russia, Abyssinia, etc.—Unfortunate effects of the Church upon the increase and diffusion of knowledge—The obligation we are under to orthodoxy for removing that unhappiness that existed because of ignorance—What is the correct system to pursue in education—The test.

115844

H
F1427 The factors of civilization. vol.2.

DATE. NAME OF BORROWER.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU